

The Slavic and East European Journal

Winter 1960

New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII), No. 4

Published by the
**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS
OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES**

AATSEEL OFFICERS, 1960

I. National Officers

President: Leon Twarog, Ohio State Univ.
Vice Presidents: Deming Brown, Univ. of Michigan
Albert Parry, Colgate Univ.
Francis J. Whitfield, Univ. of California (Berkeley)
Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne State Univ.
N. F. M. L. T. A. Delegate: J. T. Shaw (1960-63)
Executive Council: the above-listed Officers, plus
Claude P. Lemieux, U.S. Naval Academy
Zbigniew Folejewski, Univ. of Wisconsin
(the two most recent past Presidents)

II. Chapter Officers

California Chapter

President: Ludmilla A. Patrick, Univ. of California (Berkeley)
Vice President: Jack Posin, Stanford Univ.
Secretary-Treasurer: Richard W. Leland, Co-ordinator
AATSEEL (Calif.), Oakland Public Schools

Connecticut Chapter

President: Olga Svetlik, Univ. of Bridgeport
Vice President: Alexander Schenker, Yale Univ.
Secretary-Treasurer: William Mara, Stamford High School

Florida Chapter

President: Eva Friedl, Univ. of Miami
Vice Presidents: Theodore Concevitch, Manatee Coll.
Grace Dupre Brown, Miami Beach Senior High School
Treasurer: Virginia Williamson, Miami Jackson High School
Recording Secretary: Robert H. MacDonald, Wm. Jennings Bryan
Elementary School
Secretary: Michael A. Negrich, North Miami Senior High School

Illinois Chapter

President: Hugh McLean, Univ. of Chicago
Secretary: Raissa Palyi, Univ. of Chicago

Indiana Chapter

President: J. T. Shaw, Indiana Univ.
Vice President: Catherine Hughes, FL Teacher-Coordinator,
Gary High Schools
Secretary-Treasurer: George F. Roe, Speedway High School

Massachusetts Chapter

President: Irwin Weil, Brandeis Univ.
Secretary-Treasurer: Eleanora Korzeniowska, Emmanuel Coll.

Michigan Chapter

President: Nikolai P. Poltoratzky, Michigan State Univ.
Vice President: Ida Paper, Redford High School, Detroit
Secretary-Treasurer: Horace W. Dewey, Univ. of Michigan

(continued on inside back cover)

The Slavic and East European Journal

New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII), No. 4

Winter 1960

CONTENTS

Spectre of Nothingness: The Privative Element in the Poetry of Zinaida Hippus	Oleg A. Maslenikov	299
Karel Čapek's <u>R.U.R.</u> and A. A. Tolstoj's <u>Revolt of the Machines</u>	William A. Harkins	312
Notes of Boris Pasternak's <u>Doktor Živago</u>	Míriam A. Šajković	319
Aspect and Tense in Russian	V. Terras	331
A Note on a Type of Hendiadys in Technical Russian	R. H. Stacy	345
List of Soviet Periodicals in the Social Sciences and Humanities Initially Accessioned by the Library of Congress During 1959	Norman Henley	347

REVIEWS

Avraham Yarmolinsky, <u>Literature Under Communism</u> , and George Gibian, <u>Interval of Freedom</u>	Gleb Struve	360
Vladimir Mayakovsky, <u>Klop, Stixi, Poëmy—The Bedbug and Selected Poetry</u> , tr. Max Hayward and George Reavey	Walter Vickery	365
Szczepan K. Zimmer, <u>Stanislaw Wyspiański: A Biographical Sketch</u>	Olga Scherer-Virski	366
Anton Slodnjak, <u>Geschichte der slowenischen Literatur</u>	Harold J. Klagstad, Jr.	367
Morris Halle, <u>The Sound Pattern of Russian</u>	Thomas F. Magner	369
André von Gronicka and Helen Bates-Yakobson, <u>Essentials of Russian: Pronunciation, Conversation and Comprehension</u> . .	Morton Benson	371

New titles now available:

Modern Russian Reader—2nd Edition by Lila Pargment

This book is intended primarily for students at the intermediate level, acquainted with the most commonly used Russian words and with the basic principles of grammar.

The basic aim of this Reader is to serve toward the development of an extensive vocabulary. Most of the stories in the collection appear in their original form and are arranged in order of gradually increased length and difficulty. An excellent book for the student in acquiring a ready reading ability. Included are *Questions, Summaries, and Vocabulary*.

Advanced Conversational Russian by Nicholas Maltzoff

Designed for advanced conversational classes. There are ten conversational lessons and five debates. The book presents a selection of useful Russian sentences and a large number of idioms and common expressions. Each lesson is supplemented by a vocabulary and a list of assignments.

Tests For Simplified Russian Grammar

A series of eight four-page objective tests covering the subject matter in Simplified Russian Grammar.

For a complete catalogue of over 50 Russian texts and other items for Russian classes, write to:

PITMAN PUBLISHING CORPORATION

2 West 45th Street, New York 36, New York

Announcing the new . . .

Basic Russian—Book II

by Mischa Fayer

For second-year high school classes. Is a sequel to the widely used *Basic Russian—Book I*, incorporating all of the popular features of that text: controlled building of vocabulary; interesting illustrated narratives; a wealth of exercise material, including conversational drills.

In Book II many of the narratives focus on Russian culture and historical figures. There are over 50 illustrations directly related to the narratives. The vocabulary has been expanded to include an analysis of roots and idioms. Greater attention has been given to oral drills. There are five major sections, each containing five units of new material and a sixth unit for review.

With the publication of this new text, high school teachers will for the first time be able to provide their students with an integrated two-year program. A complete teacher's manual will be available.

For the first-year class, we recommend:

Basic Russian—Book I

Workbook for Basic Russian—Book I

Records for Basic Russian—Book I

Manual for Basic Russian—Book I

Write for your complete catalog

PITMAN PUBLISHING CORPORATION
2 West 45th Street, New York 36, New York

The Conscience of the Revolution

Communist Opposition in Soviet Russia

By Robert Vincent Daniels. An incisive analysis of how Communism developed in the crucial formative years between 1917 and 1929, focusing on the clash between leaders guided by an interest in practical power and those who clung to theory and program. A Russian Research Center Study. \$10.00

National Consciousness in Eighteenth Century Russia

By Hans Rogger. This study of 18th-century Russian life and letters convincingly shows that the impact of European attitudes, contrary to many arguments, was already forcing Russians of that period to articulate a national cultural identity. A Russian Research Center Study. \$6.75

The Transformation of Russian Society

Aspects of Social Change Since 1861

Edited by Cyril E. Black. Since the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, Russian society has moved from a predominantly agrarian to a predominantly industrial way of life. This book of essays by experienced students of Russia opens new avenues for the study of modern Russia by outlining the impacts of change during this key century on government, social structure, education, scholarship, and religion; family, youth, and human welfare; personal and social values. \$9.75

The Soviet Industrialization Controversy, 1924-1928

By Alexander Erlich. A systematic interpretive account of the debate among the leading Soviet Communist theoreticians and non-party economists during the '20s as to how the prospective industrialization of Russia should be accomplished. The study casts severe doubt on major Soviet rationalizations for the Stalinist policies finally adopted—a point with important implications for current discussions of economic planning for underdeveloped countries. A Russian Research Center Study. \$6.00

The Singer of Tales

By Albert B. Lord. Here the reader becomes a witness to the fascinating process of poetic composition as it survives today among the nonliterate bards of Yugoslavia. The songs of the "guslars"—collected, transcribed, and interpreted—make possible a new understanding of how oral epics are created and transmitted; one that raises questions concerning the literary origins of epic poems such as the "Iliad," the "Odyssey," "Beowulf," and "Chanson de Roland." Charts and musical examples. \$6.75

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

An Arresting New Series

of Five Graded

These five readers offer a carefully graded introduction to a rich literary heritage. The first two books present three contemporary Soviet authors whose language and ideas belong to our day. The third reader comes from the pen of Gorky, the father of "socialist realism", the prevailing school of Soviet literature. His work bridges the contemporary period and the Golden Age, represented in the readers by Turgenyev's *First Love* and Dostoevsky's *Netochka Nezvanova*.

Each reader, divided into chapters for convenience in making assignments, includes footnotes, questions for oral discussion, exercises, and a Russian-English glossary. The exercises provide, in the course of the series, a thorough review of the fundamentals of Russian grammar with appropriate drill. The first three readers are somewhat simplified; the remaining two present the complete original text.

RUSSIAN READERS

Edited by LUDMILLA BUKETOFF TURKEVICH, *Chairman of the Russian Department, Douglass College, Rutgers University*, and V. TSCHEBOTARIOFF BILL, *Lecturer in Russian, Princeton University*

- I. K. Paustovsky, *Zayachi lapy* (*Rabbit's Paws*)
N. Novoslova, *Zinochka*
- II. M. Sholokhov, *Sud'ba cheloveka* (*The Fate of Man*)
- III. M. Gorky, *Chelkash*
- IV. I. Turgenev, *Pervaya lyubov'* (*First Love*)
- V. F. Dostoevsky, *Netochka Nezvanova*
Paperbound



D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.

120 Alexander Street

Princeton, New Jersey

PASTERNAK SPEAKS

(recorded in 1958)

This is not a high fidelity recording: it was made in Pasternak's home on a small portable machine. But its historical importance far outweighs any technical deficiencies. The author of *Doctor Zhivago* is, we think, unlikely to have been preserved on disc or tape by his own countrymen, and this record of his voice is probably the only one.

A leaflet accompanying the record gives the original Russian texts of the poems "Night" and "At the Hospital."

Contents: Side 1 from *An Essay in Autobiography* "On the Poet Alexander Blok" (in Russian)

Special U.S.
Library and
Educational
price \$2
including
postage

Side 2 Band 1—*Night* (in Russian)
 Band 2—*At the Hospital* (in Russian)
 Band 3—*Literature Today* (in German)
 Band 4—*To a French Musician* (in French)

Discurio 9 Shepherd Street London W1 England

Physicist?

HISTORIAN?

Diplomat?

WORLD TRAVELER?

Whatever the goals of your high school students, a knowledge of Russian will be indispensable to their future.

FIRST COURSE IN RUSSIAN, PART ONE

by Joseph C. Doherty and Roberta Lander Markus, is a textbook written to fulfill the specific needs of the average high school student who may be studying a foreign language for the first time. Here is a lively course in Russian, which presents the living language as it is spoken and written. While the text combines the formal and oral approaches in order to give the student a solid background in the elements of Russian grammar as well as a useful speaking vocabulary, it opens a window on Russian life—the people, their history, geography, and literature.

FIRST COURSE IN RUSSIAN is Part One of a three-book series of forty lessons, designed to cover three years of high school study. PART ONE, comprising sixteen lessons, covers the first year's work.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

4 IMPORTANT REASONS WHY Cosmos Travel Bureau IS THE LEADING AGENCY FOR TRAVEL TO RUSSIA and Eastern Europe

COSMOS was the FIRST . . .

travel agency to negotiate post-war travel agreements with INTOURIST, the Soviet tourist organization, and with the government tourist agencies of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria.

COSMOS has the EXPERIENCE . . .

to provide you with the most competent advice on travel to Russia and Eastern European countries. Cosmos' expert staff has traveled extensively through these areas, and can advise you from first-hand experience.

COSMOS has the REPUTATION . . .

proved by the thousands of people for whom we have arranged trips to Russia and Eastern Europe, including many of the most distinguished American leaders in all walks of life.

COSMOS can ARRANGE . . .

your travel to any part of the world. For complete information on budget and deluxe travel to Russia and Eastern Europe, consult Cosmos Travel Bureau, Inc.—first and foremost in its field!

COSMOS opens the world for you!

COSMOS TRAVEL BUREAU, Inc.

GABRIEL REINER, President

45 West 45th Street, New York 36, N.Y.

Я ГОВОРЮ ПО-РУССКИ

JOSEPH E. HARSKY
Univ. of Pittsburgh

A Text-Work-Book for a two-year course at the elementary level.

METHOD—Dialogues preceded by grammatical drills.

Numerous repetitive exercises.

Fixation of speech patterns.

Extensive drills on inflections.

Self-correcting reading exercises.

Grammar in action rather than in theory.

Learning by hearing, speaking, reading, writing.

APPROACH—95% of the content in Russian.

5% in English (simplified explanations).

PACE—Deliberately slow, leading to thorough assimilation.

FORMAT—8½ by 11 in loose-leaf form. 30 lessons—145 pages.

PRICE—\$3.50; for teachers \$3.00; class orders 15% off.

ADDRESS: J. E. Harsky, 1123 Richmond St. Pittsburgh (18), Pa.

Indiana University
Eleventh Annual Russian Workshop
June 14 to August 11, 1961

Eight-Week Russian Workshop:

A full-time program of intensive language study that makes it possible to acquire the equivalent of a year of college Russian in eight weeks. Emphasis is placed on developing facility in the spoken language. Sections average ten students, and the work is conducted on four levels, corresponding to the first, second, third, and fourth years of college Russian. The first three years each carry nine hours of undergraduate credit. The fourth-year course carries eight hours of credit, upperclass or graduate.

Russian Language Study Tour:

A four-week visit to the Soviet Union conducted by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. All students are required to sign a pledge to speak only Russian throughout the trip. Open only to students with at least two years or the equivalent of college Russian who take the special preparatory course for the tour during the first six weeks of the Russian Workshop. The preparatory course and the tour carry a total of ten hours of credit.

For further information and application forms, write

Dr. Joseph T. Shaw
Director, Russian Workshop
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

**Typewriters in Russian
and Other Languages**

New and reconditioned machines available . . . Portables and office size . . . Also other business machines.

**ALL LANGUAGES TYPEWRITER
CO.**

Dept. SE
119 W. 23rd St., New York 11, N.Y.
CHelsea 3-8086

A New and Important Book
**BEGINNER'S BOOK
IN RUSSIAN**

As A Second Language
Series 1

A unique contribution in meeting the greatly increasing need for an effective introduction and approach to the teaching of the Russian language: Edited by Helen B. Yakobson, Head of the Slavic Department, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Recommended For:
ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY SCHOOLS
COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES
ADULT EDUCATION CLASSES

PRICE \$2.75
(10% Discount on 10 or more copies)

Publishers:
Educational Services
1730 Eye St., N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

SPECTRE OF NOTHINGNESS: THE PRIVATIVE ELEMENT IN THE POETRY OF ZINAIDA HIPPIUS

By Oleg A. Maslenikov

University of California (Berkeley)

"Die Wüste wächst: weh dem, der Wüsten birgt"
(Nietzsche)

"Pystynnyj šar v pustoj pustyne"
(Hippius)

I

On the literary Olympus of Russian modernism one of the most important places indisputably belongs to Zinaida Nikolaevna Hippius-Merežkovskaja (1867-1945). Whatever one's opinion be of her as a person, Hippius will remain one of the most significant creative artists of the "Silver Age" of Russian literature. As befits a genuine Modernist poet, Hippius in her verses seeks to break away from the canons of established traditions—to embrace the extremes in her striving to "transvaluate all values." Her attitude is typical for a Russian writer of the 1890's - 1900's,¹ and in this respect Hippius stands close to such "coryphees" of Symbolism as Brjusov, Ivanov, and Belyj.

Hippius, in her technique, which reflects an implied adherence to a dualistic, anti-positivist world view, may be placed with Blok, Belyj, Ivanov, and their teacher Vladimir Solov'ev (as well as with Bal'mont, Sologub, and the early Brjusov) among the Symbolists. She usually selects her poetical images and figures from the world of sensate and emotional experiences, and so presents them as to imply that some mysterious bond exists between the world of external reality and that of another, invisible,

vague and mysterious immanency.

Her attitude toward all phenomena of the physical world resembles that of a superstitious savage. Chance, as an abstract causation, almost does not exist for her. On the contrary, every phenomenon, every physical aspect of what we commonly regard as "reality," holds for her a hidden significance that derives from another existence.² And in her dualistic view, Hippius is a genuine symbolist.

In her thematics, Hippius stands apart from most of her fellow poets, and may be regarded as an outstanding representative of the "decadent" component of Russian Symbolism.³

Her poetry abounds in themes that strongly differentiate it from that of, say, Andrej Belyj. The distinction is seen in her partiality for such elements as the demonic, evil, and the morbid. It is seen also in her repeated reference to her own isolation, impotence, insignificance, and in her awareness of paralyzing inertia and dispassion, and in her penchant for lightless, sullen hues.⁴ It is to the province of the thematic element, therefore, that Hippius's greatest original contribution to Russian poetry belongs.

II

The poetry of Hippius, especially her first book of verse (St. Petersburg, 1904), presents an eerie picture of her poetic world.

It is a world of damp, shadowy whispers that melt into silence; it is a realm of heavy, bitter odors that evaporate into the nocturnal abyss; it is a domain of chill, bleak joylessness that blends with inescapable pain; it is a Manichean world in which the visage of the Evil One looms larger and more significant than does the image of the Creator, or the Savior. Despite the number of poems in which the religious motif is dominant, the reader is not impressed by any real depth of Christian feelings in Zinaida Hippius,⁵ whereas when she records that "Someone greedy, dark-visaged" visits her at night—"Kto-to žadnyj, temnolikij / Ko mne prixodit po nočam" (83)—one has no doubts that for her (as for Vladimir Solov'ev) the Devil is a reality and no mere figment of the imagination.⁶ This demonic element, reflected in some of her finest verses, lends them a peculiar intensity and pathos.

In her poetry one feels a renunciation of life, of any desire for light, joy, love, excitement. In other words, much of her verse reflects the truly modernist rejection of Ivan Karamazov in his offer to return to his Creator his "ticket of admission" to life. In my present paper I shall attempt to show how this rejection of life is reflected in the poetry of Hippus in the form of what we may refer to as the Phantom of Nothingness.

III

Perhaps the most important single motif that recurs in the early poetry of Hippus⁷ is that of privativism. It is symbolized by what I have called the Spectre of Nothingness, which seems to haunt her everywhere. Her verses are filled with negative constructions and references to voids that seem to engulf her very existence.⁸

A few examples may illustrate the nature of Hippus's vocabulary. Her poetry abounds with such negative references⁹ as:

bezdonnost' (90, 165)
 bezmolvie (13, 44, 51, 64)
 beskonečnost' (33, 51, 141)
 bessilie (95, 145, 159)
 besstrastie (129)
 bestennost' (65)
 molčanie (12, 23, 51, 57, 67, 79, 117, 135, 153, 173)
 mrak (49, 51, 69, 79, 102, 107)
 tišina (10, 20, 21, 24, 30, 35, 44, 47, 51, 59, 65, 69, 70,
 71, 125, 171)
 zabvenie (19, 23, 25, 29, 35, 37, 55, 71, 113, 151, 159)

and such phrases as "nepodvižnyj mrak" (69) and "kto-to iz mraka molčanija" (51) lend the negative image an illusion of an extra dimension of depth.

Even more revealing are her epithets:

bezglazyj:	večnost' b—aja (136)
bezglasnyj:	Stiks b— (71); b—ye viden'ja (157); mol'ba b—aja (174)
bezdonnyj:	b— smysl (139)
bezmolvnyj:	b— vozvrat snega (55); b— veter (157)
beskrylyj:	b—ye mečty (119)
besplodnyj:	b—aja duma (41)

bessil'nyj:	b—aja tolpa (32), b—užas (48), b—oe serdce (69), b—ye mečty (119)
nenužynyj:	n—aja ljubov' (16), n—koster (150)
nepodvižnyj:	n—prud (30); n—ye tent (51), meab n— (69)
neprivetnyj:	n—vsor (44)
nejasnyj:	n—aja lazur' (49), n—aja vera (147)
nejarklj:	n—fonar' (71)
gluxoj:	g—put' (13)
nagoj:	n—aja noč' (47)
pokinutyj:	p—istočnik (63)
tixij:	t—ie stony (17), t—spos (18), t—prud (30); t—aja lampada (51), t—oe serdce (97); t—ie šagi (117); t—aja savod' (153)

The above list should be expanded to include such negative "participial" forms as:

nevedomyj (31, 40, 52)	
nevoploščennyj (44)	
nedvižimyj:	svet mesjaca n— (10)
neezžennyj:	n—put' (13)
neispolnimyj:	n—aja mečta (57)
neponjatyj:	n—učitel' (20)
neroždennyj:	n—ye sozvučija (44)
necarstvennyj:	n—put' (145)

Her vocabulary thus deals with a negative reality—an essence paradoxically remarkable for depleting the absence of something. Hippis thus finds herself operating in a vacuum—a physical and emotional void. It is the spectre of this void that haunts her poetic imagery.

The first manifestation of the Void that encompasses Hippis is a realization of her own isolation. She finds herself alone, with no deity and no companions. She has no one to turn to for solace or aid. Her attitude toward her Creator is typical of the *fin de siècle* intellectual. She feels both that God has rejected her¹⁰—"Bog sozdal nas bez vdoxoven'ja / I poljubit', sozdav, ne mog" (32)—and that despite her yearning to pray, she is aware of a frustrating inability to do so: "Mne blizok Bog, no ne mogu molit'sja" (12).

Lacking in spiritual satisfaction, she feels, as befits a genuine Decadent, that life is meaningless, all the more so since she cannot accept the companionship of human beings. She can find no reflection of the divine spirit in the people who surround her. The human race seems pitiful and colorless

and completely alien to her: "Ix laski žalki, ssory sery" (29). She therefore can make no attempt to adapt herself to their environment: "I ne umeju žit' s ljud'mi" (29). Finding thus that she has no desire to associate with people, she confesses that she is of a different breed: "Ja ves' inoj, ja čuždoj very" (29); and finds isolation from the mob, now in her ivory tower high above the rest of the world—"Okno moe vysoko nad zemleju / Vysoko nad zemleju" (1)—now in a monastery cell among the silent, black-robed monks,¹¹ its quiet broken only by the measured dripping of waxen tears from the glowing candles.

She realizes that isolation is sinful and diabolic, yet finds its temptation irresistible: "No est' soblazn—soblazn uedinen'ja / Ego donyne ja ne pobedil" (68). Finally she seeks solitude in the motionless woods by the still waters of an abandoned pond.

Hope, however, is short-lived, for the poet is suddenly struck by the certainty that the mob will invade her privacy even here: "I vnov' duša trepeščet, znaju, / Oni menja i zdes' najdu" (30). And now Hippus is almost willing, Ophelia-like, to obey the tempting voice which she hears whispering to her that escape lies at the bottom of the pond:¹² "... osvobožden'e . . . / Liš' tam . . . vnizu . . . na dne . . . na dne . . ." (30).

The other phantoms that comprise her all-embracing spectre seem to emerge out of the theme of solitude. As we have already seen, solitude goes hand in hand with silence, which to Hippus, a Symbolist, possesses some mysterious and evil link with the other world. It is the stillness of a pond that urges the poet to seek escape from people in its depths. This stillness, moreover, is not unlike the quiet of the slough that teems with black leeches: "Tam, gde zavod' mraja, gde molot reka / Višu p'javok, lipnuščix k kornju rosmika" (133). But the real element of the stillness is Night. Hippus listens to the silence as one listens for the inaudible footsteps of an enemy moving stealthily in the dark: "Ja slusaju molčanie, kak slusaju vruga" (135). The same silence of the night is broken eerily by the inaudible movement of falling rain—"Vo tme odet neslyšim dožd . . ." (157)—or perhaps by the soundless flight of the black wind—"... Vdal' lezít bez zvuka černyj veter" (157).

On occasion, Hippus finds the black silence broken by someone's mysterious voice (undoubtedly that of the Devil):

"Kto-to iz mraka molčan'ja" (51); or by the symbolic, Poesque thumping of the heart and by the ticking of the clock as though to convey the poet's belief that a bond exists between the world of earthly sounds and another world. "Polnočnaja ten'. Tišina. / Stuk serdca i stuk časov. / Kak noč' neponjatno černa. / Kak tjažek ee pokrov . . ." (69). Even the halting, stuttering beat of the very dol'nik,¹³ which occurs above in the second and fourth lines and breaks the regularity of the expected amphibrach pattern of the first and third lines, seems to suggest a supernatural connection with something vague, mysterious, and—evil.

Silence and solitude are the lot of a true Decadent poet. In the poetry of Hippius, silence and solitude are no mere incidental chord that resounds occasionally, by chance. Silence and solitude are a leitmotif, almost a major theme, throughout her early verse.

In one of her poems, "Ograda" (117-118), Hippius combines several of her privative motifs in one symbolic reference. The poet, after a long and torturous journey, during which he has significantly abandoned his two companions,¹⁴ finds himself standing alone outside the gates of his walled-off paradise. As he waits, no one will come to let him inside. His shouts, entreaties, and demands seem to rouse no one who might open the gate to him, and his expectations and hopes, like those of many heroes of stories by Leonid Andrejev,¹⁵ are repeatedly met only with a devastating silence, darkness, and quiet "Molčan'e, mrak, it tisina" (117-118). Thus we find ourselves confronted with yet another of Hippius's phantoms—that of darkness. Darkness in her poetry is an overpowering debilitating element: it is the natural habitat of the Devil. The nocturnal gloom, broken only occasionally by the faint rays of a waning moon, symbolizes the immobility and the paralysis of a complete cessation of life: "Ja znaju, — bessil'nyx serdec / Ešče nepodvižnej mrak" (69).

Absence of light suggests the absence of life and absence of motion. From the nocturnal darkness thus arises another of Hippius's phantoms; it is the spectre of immobility, as seen when the poet stands chained to the earth above an abyss, yearning to soar into the beyond and yet unable to move: "Stoju nad propast'ju—nad nebesami, — / I uletet' k lazuri ne mogu" (12). It again looms in the stagnant slough with leeches clinging motionless to the roots of equally still rushes.

Now it is seen in the thread of a spider's web hanging motionless in the sky—"Nit' pautinnaja ... povisla v nebesax" (125)—or in the motionless reeds now standing hollow and barren, now heavy and pregnant, but in either case motionless and silent as the water itself: "V nedvižnyz, sty-nuščix vodax ..." (23); "... nepodvižen tixij prud" (30). Even the shadows of the night stand still and motionless as death itself: "Teni lunny nepodvižnye, / Teni, kak smert', nepodvižnye" (51).

When dealing with abstract negative concepts, Hippus frequently resorts to the simile in order to give them greater substance—to tie them more closely to the world of everyday experience. Here, too, the privative aspect of her poetry becomes all-important. In depicting her soul, for example, Hippus speaks of its immobility, as though it were encased in the viscous, heavy slime of a stagnant pond: "Duša, slovno tinoju / Okutana vjazkoju" (151). Life itself seems as stifling as the unyielding coils of a serpent: "Sliškom tupo kol'ca žizni sžali / Imedlennye, dušat, katzmeja" (16). The symbol of her sightless sky presses down like a sepulchral slab: "A sverxu, kak plita mogil'naja, / Slepje davjat nebesa" (32).

I am not implying that all her images are devoid of motion; nevertheless, when Hippus does portray movement, it is quiet, measured, and almost imperceptible. It is almost like the breathing silence that the poet detects in the dark: "Dyxan'ja slyšu tišiny" (35). In her "Flowers of Night" she depicts the same deliberate movement, when the poisonous drops are recorded falling rhythmically onto the carpet: "S jadovitogo aruma merno / Kapli padajut na kover" (18). Even the trees in the forest and the reeds in the pond stand motionless, unswayed by breath of wind.

Time and again Hippus characterizes her phantom of immobility by the epithet "heavy." It is as though the very air had suddenly become weighted down with lead: "... vdrug otjaželelo ..." (135). The weight of the blanket of night is an apt symbol for the absence of motion, or for the deathlike stillness of the heavy casket which she portrays: "Ljudi vynesli grob belyj, tjaželyj" (137). Even the very landscape reflects the static quiescence seen in the glimpses of the pond and slough: "Tjaželaja tina ko dnu osedaet" (27). Even the boughs of trees stand motionless, weighted down with snow in the unmoving air: "Otjaželej, ponikli dolu vetki ..." (50).

All nature in its quiescence assumes a strangely lifeless

aspect. Small wonder, then, that the still-life tableaux that Hippius occasionally depicts should seem even less alive. "The Clock Has Stopped" affords one such example: "Časy ostanovilas'. Dvižen'ja bol'she net" (135). The table with its unremoved dishes, its tablecloth drooping "shroudlike" to the floor, and the lamp standing dark, as well as the motionless clock, suggest the immobility of death. "Na skaterti xolodnoj, neubrannyj pribor. / Kak savan belyj, skladki svisajut na kover. / I v lampe ne mercaet blestjaščaja duga. / Ja slušajut molčan'e, kak slušajut vraga" (135).

The silence and the immobility of the images taken from Hippius's verses undeniably remind one of the Dragon of Death that haunted Tolstoj (to borrow Professor Lavrin's term) and the death theme that recurs time and again in the writings of the Modernists.¹⁶ The fact of its appearance in the poetry of Hippius is therefore not surprising. She is in good company.

Yet, where some writers are terrified by the thought of death, and others (like Sologub) see in it a hopeful escape from life, Hippius, who implies that life is onerous at best, does not anticipate in death any change either for the better or for the worse. Her poem "In the Beyond" ("Tam") in the spirit of fatalistic resignation, expresses complete apathy toward death. Charon is portrayed ferrying the poet across the Styx. The stony sky above is immobile, and the heavy boat glides through the leaden waters of the dark silence into nothingness. And the poet, as though echoing a previous fear that no fear exists in his soul—"Mne strašno, čto straxa v duše moej net" (11)—admits that the only emotion he feels in the face of one of the most significant events in man's conscious life is that of empty boredom—"I vse mne zdes' kažetsja stranno-nevažnym, / I serdce, kak tam—na zemle—ravnodušno ... / ... I tak že skučno, kak bylo i prežde" (72). And yet to call Hippius's poetry unemotional would be to do her a great injustice. One needs to recall only her incantations addressed to Petersburg. They are charged with emotional undercurrents. Apathy—lack of emotion—nevertheless, plays an important role in her decadent verse.

Although a rebellious strain does occur in her poetry, it is usually less convincing than is the motif of resignation. This indifference to everything, this unemotional submission to an unknown higher will (whether good or evil), resembles

a similar attitude toward life by Feodor Sologub, and stands in contrast to the self-assertions of such of her contemporaries as Brjusov, Bal'mont, and the early Belyj. The emotional void that she portrays is seen in her reference to the emptiness of everyday existence, symbolized by the gray room, and the repeated use of the negative particle *ne*.

"Seraja komnata. Reči ne spešnye. / Daže ne strašnye, daže ne grešnye, / Ne umilennye, ne oskorblennye ... / ... nikogo ne ljublju. / ničego ne znaju ..." (91).

Even in a scene which one might expect to be filled with pathos, as that in which the poet listens mutely to "love dying"—"Ja slušal bez slov, kak ljubov' umirala" (75)—Hippus, maintaining a complete indifference, does not admit feeling any emotion: "Mne bylo ne grustno, mne bylo ne bol'no" (75). In view of this indifference (which is nevertheless basically romantically emotional, rather than classically dispassionate), the use of such symbols as cold, snow, wind, fog, absence of fire, cannot be unexpected.

A hearth without its fire—"I davno kamin bez ognja" (17)—is a setting typical for Hippus. It leads logically to the spiritual frustration of the scene in which the poet seeking and expecting martyrdom, in being burned at the stake, discovers that his sacrifice is suddenly unwanted—"Koster gotov i net ognja" (150)—and the suffering for which he had hoped is rejected. Instead of self-sacrifice, in place of a deed of heroism, he is met with frustration; instead of claiming love and compassion as his reward, he finds only an unresponsive cold.

IV

When viewed in historical perspective, the privative motifs in the poetry of Hippus resemble similar elements in the works of Gogol' and Tjutčev.

A few random references will quickly indentify Gogol's penchant for depicting the absence of that which ordinarily is inherent in something. One need only recall the sieve-like roofs of the peasant hovels, the rents in the lining of Akakij Akakievič's old coat, or the pits in the roadbed of the highways. One need only remember the plasterless walls of the houses in the town of B.; the perforation through the middle of some general's portrait that adorned old Petrovič's

snuff-box and now, faceless, reduced a once-famous dignitary to an anonymous nothingness; or the anonymity of the barbershop sign—with the name of its proprietor completely erased by time and the elements. These examples, climaxed finally by the very idea of "Dead Souls"—souls who are actually nothing but "a sound that is imperceptible to one's senses"—"just pfft! Pfft!—nothing at all"—testifies to Gogol's obsession with life's vacuities.

An important distinction, however, must be observed between Hippius's treatment of nothingness and that of Gogol'. Gogol's images of the void are usually connected with the physical, tangible world. They are materially concrete. Hippius's images of nothingness relate usually to the province of emotion and the intellect. They are symbolically abstract. And in this respect, a veritable chasm separates Hippius's post-realistic images from Gogol's "naturalistic" sketches.

In the abstractness of her world view Hippius is closer to another nineteenth century Russian literary figure—Tjutčev, than she is to Gogol'. Her vision of the void leads her to employ a number of symbols used commonly by Tjutčev.¹⁷ One of his favorite images is that of the nocturnal abyss, which yields a glimpse of the transphysical universe. The heavenly arch, aglow with starry glory, gazes at him mysteriously from its fiery bottomless depths:¹⁸ "Nebesnyj svod, gorjaščij slavoj zvezdnoj / Tainstvenno gljadit iz glubiny. / I my ... pylajuščeju bezdnoj ... okruženy" (43). Tyutchev's penchant for the privative is seen, moreover, in his image of the fleshless, invisible world swarming in the nocturnal chaos: "Mir bestelesnyj, slyšnyj no ne zrimyj, / Teper' roitsja v Xaose nočnom" (67). For Tyutchev, Chaos is a primordial, unbridled, sightless and naked living creature, at once awesome and dear—"O, strašnyx pesen six ne poj / Pro drevnij Xaos, pro rodimyj" (58)—and the poet begs the wind to let the tempests slumber in the dark, for he can hear Chaos stirring beneath their contained fury: "O, bur' zasnuvšix ne budi— / Pod nimi Xaos ševelitsja" (58).

Since Hippius's lightless realm—"Polnočnaja ten'. Tišina." (69); "Vse tainstvenno, vse neverno ... (18)—like that of Tjutčev, also breathes mystery and dread, the revelations of the two poets seem parallel.

Nevertheless, as with Gogol', an important distinction must be observed between Tjutčev's poetic world and that of Hippius.

Her universe, as we have seen, is basically a negative, lifeless realm. Her chief images are privative; they suggest the absence of an element that is usually expected. Her domain is one of isolation and solitude (absence of beings); of silence (absence of sound); of immobility (absence of motion); of darkness (absence of light); of death (absence of life); of indifference and apathy (absence of emotion); of chill and cold (absence of life-giving warmth). Her world is quiet, mysterious, and motionless.

Tjutčev's poetic realm, on the other hand, is a living, breathing albeit sightless, invisible force, and is, above all, a constantly moving power engaged in an eternal struggle. His rebellious sea, boiling, lashing, and roaring—"I buntuet i klokočet, / Xleščet, sviščet i revet ..." (80)—is a perfect contrast to Hippus's slough, lying motionless and immobile: "Tam, gde zavod' tixaja, gde molčit reka ..." Tjutčev's night, like Hippus's darkness, is a metaphysical concept, yet unlike hers, it is full of dynamic power. Contrast again Tjutčev's image of sightless Chaos swarming in the nocturnal abyss with Hippus's motionless midnight shadows! It is precisely this dynamism which characterizes Tjutčev's night, that is absent in Hippus's dark. Her Spectre of Nothingness is motionless. Hers is a world of vacuous stillness, and its spectre though pregnant with an inner tension is essentially one of static immobility.

Notes

1. Cf. S. A. Vengerov (ed.), Russkaja literatura XX veka, I, 16 ff., 55 ff.

2. See, for example, her poem bearing the Baudelairean title "Cvety noči."

3. Without entering upon a necessarily lengthy discussion of the terms Symbolist and Decadent, for the purposes of the present paper the two will be regarded as distinct. The reader may be referred to any one of the numerous essays upon the subject written by the various theoreticians and critics of Symbolism, from Volynskij to Belyj.

4. Thus, the "decadent" element of her poetry goes beyond the "intense self-consciousness, feeling of oversubtilizing refinement, and spiritual and moral perversity," which Arthur Symonds ascribes to decadence. See his Symbolism (1919), pp. 6-7.

5. Despite such "neo-religious" verses as "Neskorbnomu učitelju" ("Iisus v odežde beloј ...") they seem pale alongside those that concern the devil. See especially, V. Zlobin's essay on Hippus: "Neistovaja duša," Vozroždenie, XLVII (1955), i, 69-74.

6. This impression, gained originally from acquaintance only with her poetry, has been substantiated in my talks with such literary figures as Vladimir Zlobin, Hippius's former secretary, and Sergey Makovsky, who had known Hippius during her lifetime.

7. This is the period which Brjusov, in referring to Hippius's prose, describes as her "purely aesthetic" period. See his essay in Vengerov, I, 178-187.

8. The frequency with which the morphemes ne-, ni-, bez-, bes-, occur in the first volume of her poetry is 7.4 percent, a figure significantly higher than the 2.4 percent norm for a 25,000 word sample obtained from 250 passages of 100 words each, selected at random from the prose of Russian writers from Puškin to Simonov. It is also higher than the 3.4 percent norm for a 12,000 word sample, similarly based on the verse of Russian poets from Deržavin to Pasternak. Harry Josselson's recent expansion of The Russian Word Count (based on a 1,000,000 word sample) would bring the figure to approximately 3.6 percent after the necessary interpolation.

9. All numbers given in the text, unless specifically stated otherwise, will refer to pages of Hippius's first volume of poetry (St. Petersburg, 1904).

10. The "Satanic" poems of Sologub also reflect the typically "decadent" theme of Man's being abandoned by his Creator. See especially "Kogda ja v burnom more plaval" ("When I Sailed the Stormy Sea"), in which Sologub narrates how he turned to the devil for help in time of mortal crisis. Curiously enough, Tjutčev in a poem "Naš vek," (1851—thus antedating both Hippius and Sologub by a half-century) also complained of the lack of belief from which mankind was suffering.

11. Most of her verses are written from a masculine point of view, with the poet's "ja" ("I") governing the masculine forms of adjectives and participial forms.

12. Concerning the theme of suicide by drowning, see my essay, "Russian Symbolism; The Mirror Theme and Allied Motifs," Russian Review, Jan. 1957, pp. 42-52.

13. I feel constrained to set straight one point in Russian versification. Hippius is usually credited (and rightly so) with being the first Symbolist to employ the dol'nik; two or three titles of her verses are usually cited in support of this claim. Her role in popularizing the dol'nik actually goes beyond the two or three titles so mentioned. She was the first among the Symbolists to make any really extensive use of this form. In her first volume of verse (comprising some 98 titles) no fewer than fifteen display the use of the lame foot. (Regular trisemes number only thirteen.) Eleven of these poems are dated prior to 1902, thus antedating any publication of Blok, who is commonly credited with popularizing this form. I quite agree with Žirmunskij evaluation of the role of German and English "Romantic dol'niks" played in the transition of Russian verse from the "metric-tonic" to the "pure tonic" forms. (See V. Žirmunskij, Vosprosy teorii literatury, pp. 251-258, esp. pp. 253-254.)

14. The theme of the poet's abandoning his companion occurs also in another poem by Hippus, "Progulka vdvoem" (65-66).

15. For example, Father Vasilij Fivejskij or Judas Iscariot. Each is certain that a heaven-worked miracle will rectify an injustice wrought by an evil Fate. Each is met, instead, by disillusion and disaster.

16. See, for example S. Andreevskij's Kniga smerti (The Book of Death), *passim*. Or compare the discussion of the death theme in the works of such an important contemporary historian of Western Symbolism as Arthur Symonds. Cf. his Symbolism (1919), esp. pp. 325 ff.

17. Tjutčev's influence is seen in the works of many another Symbolist from Merežkovskij to Ivanov, Blok, and Belyj. For a stimulating interpretation of Tjutčev's poetic art see D. Blagoj, Tri veka (Moskva, 1933), pp. 183-300. See also N. Gudzij, "Tjutčev v poëtičeskoj kul'ture russkogo simvolizma," Izvestija po russkomu jazyku i slovesnosti Ak. N., III, 465-549, with whose denial of any influence by Tjutčev I disagree.

18. The pagination for Tjutčev is from the edition of the Biblioteka Poëta (Leningrad, 1939).

KAREL ČAPEK'S R.U.R. AND A.N. TOLSTOJ'S
REVOLT OF THE MACHINES

By William E. Harkins

Columbia University

On April 14, 1924, the première of A.N. Tolstoj's drama, Revolt of the Machines (Bunt mašin), was performed in Leningrad. The work was obviously an adaptation of Karel Čapek's well-known Utopian drama, R.U.R., or Rossum's Universal Robots, as the play's expanded title had it. Tolstoj freely admitted that he had taken the theme of his play from Čapek, but minimized the extent of his indebtedness. In the introduction to the first edition of his Revolt of the Machines, Tolstoj stated: "The writing of this play was preceded by my acquaintance with the play R.U.R. by the Czech writer Karel Čapek. In its turn the theme of R.U.R. had been borrowed from the English and French. My decision to take someone else's theme was supported by the example of the great playwrights."

Thus Tolstoj suggested that the idea of R.U.R. was in effect common property, an international literary theme. He does not state what the English and French sources of Čapek's subject are, but one can guess that he was thinking of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein and Villiers de l'Isle-Adam's L'Ève future. In the first novel a scientist creates an artificial man who turns on his creator and kills him. In L'Ève future another scientist creates a beautiful female puppet who has no soul, and is therefore incapable of love. Both novels in fact anticipate Čapek's theme, as well as the philosophic idea behind it. But they lack the broader social and economic implications of Čapek's play. Čapek's robots, rising to destroy mankind, are actually expressionist symbols of the danger that modern man may be dehumanized by the very world of technological civilization which he has created.

There is an obvious internal contradiction in Tolstoj's apology. If he really owed so little to Čapek, why admit at all that he had borrowed Čapek's theme? Why not give equal

weight to his unnamed French and English sources?

In fact, Tolstoj borrowed much more than the mere theme. Characters, speeches and ideas have made their way from Čapek's play into his. Gorkij, who at the time was an expatriate from the Soviet Union, wrote indignantly of Tolstoj's appropriation:

It seems to me that we Russian littérateurs are on the verge of a big scandal which will not be flattering for us. The point is that Čapek, the Czech, has written a very interesting and talented play, and Count A. N. Tolstoj has also written a play called Bunt mašin. In a little preface to it Tolstoj acknowledges that he "took Čapek's theme," but from the text of his work it is clear that he took the characters as well and did not even hesitate to borrow whole passages of text. What is this? I can't understand it. Haste, carelessness, rejection or ignorance of literary traditions? I cannot remember anything to match Tolstoj's action; I don't think such tricks have ever been played in Russia before.²

Čapek too was understandably disturbed, though he was later reported to have been reconciled with Tolstoj when the latter visited Prague in 1935.³

From R. U. R. Tolstoj borrowed a great deal more than the theme. The character of his heroine, Jelena (Čapek's Helena), is almost unchanged. Like Čapek's heroine, she is an instinctively good person who lacks any precise ideology or abstract standard of values. Like Čapek's Helena, she destroys the single manuscript which gives the formula for the manufacture of protoplasm when she realizes the danger the discovery has brought upon mankind.

The story of the invention of artificial life is almost literally the same in the two plays. Similar, too, is the final scene, in which the robots become men and realize their ability to reproduce their kind.

A number of smaller details are also kept by Tolstoj: for example, the mysterious frenzy of the robots; the electric screen which holds the rebellious robots at bay for a time; the belated realization by man that the robots should have been created with national differences so that they would hate one another rather than their masters.

Tolstoj declared that his adaptation was an attempt to

correct the faults of Čapek's dramaturgy, which showed, in Tolstoj's words, "an inexperienced hand."⁴ But in fact Tolstoj's play is the weaker and cruder of the two. He has kept the weakest devices of Čapek's play: the improbably unique manuscript which describes the secret of making protoplasm; the siege in which the robots are delayed by an electrified screen. On the other hand, his play is ideologically cruder. On the plane of ideas he eliminates Čapek's conflict of relative "truths," according to which all the personages—Domin, Helena, Alquist, Nána, even the robots themselves—have a share of the truth.⁵ By sacrificing the interplay of ideas, none of which is completely wrong or right, Tolstoj's characters lose depth and become mere stereotypes; in consequence his play becomes little more than a melodrama. Tolstoj's entrepreneur lacks Domin's dream of achieving a better world through technology; he wants only money and power for himself. He is so cruel and crude that Jelena's marriage to him, even for idealistic reasons, becomes incomprehensible.

In one respect, to be sure, Tolstoj's dramaturgy does advance on Čapek's. This is his more fluid division of the dramatic material into many short scenes, in contrast to the structure of R. U. R., with its prologue and three acts. In his division Tolstoj followed the principles of German expressionism more faithfully. By breaking the action into short scenes, he avoids the weakness of anticlimax which is so serious a fault in Čapek's play: the essential climax of R. U. R. actually comes at the end of Act I.⁶ But at the same time, Tolstoj's short scenes lose the possibility of serious discussion which gives Čapek's play its intellectual depth. Here again, The Revolt of the Machines is closer to mere melodrama.

Tolstoj had, of course, a fixed principle in adapting R. U. R. This was to "sovietize" it, to make it over into a symbol of the struggle between capitalism and socialism. But in doing so, he frequently becomes very "un-Marxian." He simply cannot find a proper place for Čapek's robots in a socialist society.

In R. U. R., as in his later novel, The War with the Newts (Válka s mloky), Čapek adopted a neutral position: he attempted to stand independent of both capitalism and Soviet socialism. If his implied criticism of Domin's ideals

and methods is in a sense a criticism of capitalism, then the robots' revolt and the slaughter of the human race is an implicit symbol of the dangers of socialist revolution. "Who taught them [the robots] such phrases?" Domin asks rhetorically when he reads the manifesto of the rebellious robots. The implication is that the robot danger to man—the threat that modern technology may "robotize" man—is equally grave under both social orders.

For Tolstoj, on the other hand, the robots' revolt is itself a socialist revolution. They are armed and aided by the very unemployed whom they have displaced from work (an alliance which seems improbable, at the least). They rise in protest against exploitation of their labor under capitalism, though it is unclear by what dialectic process they have come to the conclusion that they are exploited. Čapek's thesis that they have conceived a hatred for man because they are superior to him, intellectually and physically (i. e., man has degenerated since he no longer needs to work), seems far more credible.

In Tolstoj's play the Soviet Union exists as a state in which socialism is already being won. Yet the Soviet attitude toward the robots and their revolt is unclear, as is the robots' attitude toward the Soviet State. It seems that the Soviet Union has no robots of its own; they are a capitalist monopoly. The question of whether or not the Soviet people could have robots (and exploit them?) is never asked. Nor does Tolstoj raise the question of what future relations could exist between the robotless Soviet Union and the federated state of robots and "unemployed" which the revolutionaries set up in America. Strangest of all is the attitude of Tolstoj's communist agitator, Mixail. He recognizes the threat which the robots, as tools of capitalism, raise to the proletariat. As a trusted employee in the robot factory, he is in a position to sabotage production and bring the manufacture of robots to an end. But he declines to do this, on the ground that "the robots are already alive." Why such an argument should apply to as yet "unborn" robots is unclear. Mixail might rather have feared that the robots might be employed (as in fact they are) to keep unemployed workers in suppression. The possibility that Mixail might make a grave mistake in judgment is particularly acute in view of the fact that he is acting alone, without instructions from either the American or Soviet Communist Party.

These unanswered questions suggest the ridiculousness of the whole ideological construction which Tolstoj has attempted to pile on Čapek's play. To Čapek's theme—men or robots?—he has added his own theme—capitalism or socialism? He has overlooked the fact that the two themes have nothing to do with one another: one might as well raise the question of whether under socialism horses and dogs are also partners with men in building a socialist order, while under capitalism they are only exploited slaves.

Tolstoj attempts to get around the difficulty by implying that the robots have already become men. In Čapek's play this transformation comes at the very end, when the robots Primus and Helena fall in love. But for Čapek this event has a special symbolic significance which follows from his expressionist use of the robot symbol. The robot symbolizes the threat to humanity raised by modern technological civilization—the danger that man may become dehumanized and robotized. The ending is a denial of this danger: life, by its own mystique, will continue to assert itself in spite of all man's attempts to regiment it. The danger is great, but in the end life—and man—will win out.

Tolstoj cannot share Čapek's idealistic vitalism, for he has chosen a Marxist and materialistic point of view. The change of his robots into men proceeds from no less than three causes. The first is mechanistic: in the laboratory certain minerals are added to the composition of protoplasm. This seems dramatically crude, but there can be no objection on Tolstoj's own materialistic premises. The second cause of the transformation is dialectic: the workers become men because they toil and are exploited. This is patently ridiculous: again the parallel of toiling, "exploited" animals suggests itself. If Tolstoj's implication is taken seriously, then it would follow that Soviet robots could not become men, for only capitalist exploitation can work this miracle. Finally, Tolstoj retains the final scene of Čapek's play: love is an evidence that the robots have become men. But this vestige of "idealism" in Tolstoj's thought was of course sharply condemned by his Soviet critics.⁷

Tolstoj's robots become men not as a literal illustration of Marx's dialectic, but rather because the dramatist requires an expressive dramatic symbol of revolution. The uprising of the robots acquires meaning as an echo of the

October Revolution. But from this point of view Tolstoj's play risks being taken as a parody of that revolution.

The ridiculousness of Tolstoj's conception is especially apparent in the final scene. As in Čapek's play, the robots are threatened with extinction, since the secret of their manufacture has been destroyed, and they cannot reproduce. Tolstoj tries to recapture the melodramatic pathos of Čapek's final act: how will life survive? In R. U. R. the question is meaningful, for man, with the sole exception of the construction engineer Alquist, is now extinct. But in Tolstoj's play it has no significance, for the citizens of the Soviet Union, along with the "millions of unemployed" elsewhere who have made common cause with the robots, survive to reproduce the human race.

Yet, in spite of its ideological confusion and melodramatic crudity, Tolstoj's play is an interesting attempt to create a socialist drama on a revolutionary theme. It is significant as an attempt to give vitality to the Soviet theater by introducing the new ideas and techniques of Central European expressionist drama. In the satirical portrayal of the Obyvatel', a vulgar petit bourgeois who comments on the play and who also appears in certain scenes which provide comic relief, Tolstoj demonstrates that he is more creative when using his own materials than those taken from Čapek. Last of all, his play is interesting as an attempt to introduce utopian themes into Soviet literature as symbols of the conflict of socialism and capitalism. Such themes, in the novels of Èrenburg, Šaginjan, and Tolstoj himself, were very popular in Soviet literature of the early and middle 1920's. Subsequent neglect of utopian subjects was one of the consequences of the liquidation of Trotskiism and the domination of Soviet literature by the doctrine of socialist realism; since the late 1920's, such fantasy has virtually been excluded from Soviet literature. This is a pity, for how can man build a better social order unless he has the vision to imagine it? And how, without fantasy, can art produce imaginative symbols which compel the interest and attention of the reader?

Notes

1. This article originally appeared in Czech translation in the magazine Svědectví, III, x (New York, 1959), 167-172. It has also been delivered as a paper at the 1959 annual meeting of AATSEEL in Chicago.
2. "Letters of Gor'kij to Kodasevič," Harvard Slavic Studies, I (1953), 314. Letter of June 2, 1924, from Sorrento.
3. Z. G. Minc and O. M. Malevič, "K. Čapek i A. N. Tolstoj," Učenyje zapiski Tartuskogo gos. universiteta, No. 65 (1958), p. 120, footnote 4. It is possible that Čapek had a similar unacknowledged debt to Russian literature on his conscience. There are striking parallels between the Čapek brothers' comedy, From the World of Insects (Ze života hmyzu) and Vsevolod Garsin's tale, "What Never Happened" (To, čego ne bylo). Professor Roman Jakobson has called the similarity of the two works to my attention.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
5. See Karel Čapek, "The Meaning of R.U.R.," Saturday Review, July 21, 1923, p. 79.
6. See P. Buzková, České drama (Prague, 1932), pp. 65-66.
7. Minc and Malevič, pp. 147 ff.

NOTES ON BORIS PASTERNAK'S DOKTOR ŽIVAGO

By Miriam Taylor Šajković

Mount Holyoke College

The writer who ventures to bring into the open "what is ever before men's eyes, all those things which the indifferent gaze fails to perceive, the whole horrid and shocking slimy mess of trifling things which have clogged our life . . ." ¹ cannot expect the applause and rush of triumph. Thus wrote the author of Dead Souls, Nikolaj Gogol'. And this has been the fate of Boris Pasternak's Doktor Živago in his own land. Gogol' was speaking in earnest of the pošlost' or commonplace smugness, the triviality and pettiness of his age. Pasternak reveals the pošlost' of the revolutionary period in Russia of this century, and, further, he brings us face to face with the complexity of our human nature: the potential and actuality of a nobility of soul, our moral obliquity, and the veritable web of the gropings, confusions, and contradictions within the human soul.

In his artistic methodology, Pasternak has tried to fuse three approaches: the epic structure in the expansive historical canvas akin to Tolstoj, the symbolistic poetics (metaphor and simile), and the polyphonic or "many-voiced" structural development of characterization of Dostoevskij. Dmitry Grigorieff has written that Pasternak's literary method is "a fusion of the realistic and mythological layers of the material. Vjacheslav Ivanov calls it 'realistic symbolism.'" ² This comes close to an understanding of Pasternak's method, but for a more adequate analysis I should maintain the attempt by the author in a three-fold synthesis: epic-symbolistic poetic-polyphonic.

Herbert Bowman's observation that "the essence of the book is to be found in Živago's reflections" and that "the book becomes richer the farther it moves away from the spectacular events, the deeper it moves into the self of Živago" ³ is only partly true. Živago and other characters are not bloodless outlines or mere vehicles for the author's polemics.

Penetrating through the historical events of twentieth century Russia, one hears the voices of many people. On the psychological level of a "higher realism" akin to Dostoevskij,⁴ each voice is a living soul. No one voice is Pasternak, or, conversely, all voices are Pasternak. The author allows full freedom to his characters to go their own ways. Pasternak has succeeded in giving us a work which combines this astonishing realism written with a remarkable objectivity of the human situation. In the sweep of the drama, the pulse of life in human souls is given clear character. Certainly the reader grasps the author's "intense awareness of life and his belief in the capability and potential dignity of the human soul."⁵ Conversely, however, Pasternak's characters reveal the potentials and actuality of evil as well: lust and opportunism (Komarovskij), fanaticism (Pamfil Palyx's tragedy), sadism (Tanja's story). This complex drama is treated with understanding and compassion, and a sound knowledge of human nature. Pasternak has gained a vision akin to Gogol's and Dostoevskij's. Like them, Pasternak is religious, and is as Robert L. Jackson has stated, imbued with their "moral fervor" and a "deep sense of responsibility before Russian life."⁶ The poet Alexander Blok wrote: "We, the children of Russia's terrible years." But as Pasternak noted, Blok meant this in a metaphorical sense, for before the revolution "the children were not children, but the sons, the heirs, the intelligentsia, and the terrors were not terrible but sent from above, apocalyptic; that's different." And with the revolution: "Now the metaphorical has become literal, children are children and the terrors are terrible, there you have the difference."⁷

Some critics have been too quick to judge the characters, particularly the hero, Jurij Živago, with an ethical categorism combined with the political debate of whether the author and his work are anti-communist, and champion a Western liberal individualism. But actually who can so judge the characters so light-heartedly, when what Pasternak has done is to reopen the entire valuation perspective in human affairs? There is no neat ethical "categorical imperative" as in Tolstoyian morality; there is no easy environmental solution involving justice, whether political, social, or personal. We may not "like" Živago's kind of heroism; we may deplore his betrayal to Tonja (Živago himself was acutely aware of his dilemma with Larisa, and his remorse is quite clear). We

may be disgusted with his compromises and his active indifference during the last years of his life as he "goes to seed." We may also say with Peter Viereck that Živago's victory lies in his "nerve of failure" in the newly created Soviet society, "for even if the adherence to the private life and love means death in the end, it is still worth doing, for failure here will be honorable."⁸ Also in his idealistic paralysis during the last eight or ten years of his life Živago resembles Gončarov's Oblomov, as Vladimir Šajković has noted, for Živago dreams but cannot bring himself to "act."⁹ We may romanticize the relationship between Jurij and Larisa and develop a mythological interpretation to justify it, as several critics have done. However, one thing is certain, and it is that contemporary man is groping and seeking on his own with the roots of tradition in faith and in life severed or almost severed.

The concrete individual person, man, is the focal point in Pasternak. And one can state further that, as the protagonist lives through vital and critical experiences, the kind of individualism we come to understand is more complex than at first thought. There is, of course, the championing of the "free man" in the Western tradition, but this rests upon the ultimate foundation—the religious view of life. The critic Edmund Wilson was right when he wrote that Doktor Živago "presents a radical criticism of all our supposedly democratic but more and more centralized societies. The criticism of Pasternak's novel is directed at conditions and tendencies which are in evidence all over the world and which have lately become pronounced in the United States."¹⁰ He further quoted Larisa's words about the First World War: the disaster of losing faith in one's own convictions, the moral promptings of one's soul, and instead follow some kind of "general notions."¹¹

The particular "Russian" setting, the specific historical events and times, bring into relief the universality of the basic questions of human life which men ask at all times. The broadest formulation is the question of immortality. Pasternak here reaffirms Dostoevskij: "Neither man nor nation can exist without a sublime idea—and on earth there is, but one sublime idea—namely, the idea of immortality of man's soul—since all other "sublime" ideas of life, which give live to man, are merely derived from this one idea."¹²

This goes beyond the politico-philosophical question of individualism versus communism, and the related political debate between liberal democracy and Marxist socialism. Properly seen, the position of an individual's integrity of soul or personality, and his place in active participation in society are rooted first of all in his faith. The great Russian realistic writers, and Pasternak follows and continues in their tradition, often present difficulty for Western readers, precisely because of the integrality of their thought. There is no separation or compartmentalization of human problems. The questions man raises in theology, philosophy, ethics, politics, sociology, culture, economics, et al., are all interwoven, intertwine.

The fundamental metaphysical problem, then, is the question of immortality. As Jurij Živago states it: "I think one should be true to immortality which is another word for life, a stronger word for it."¹³ Again, Dostoevskij had written in The Diary of a Writer: "The idea of immortality is life itself—'live life,' its ultimate formula, the mainspring of truth and just consciousness for humankind."¹⁴ And Dostoevskij further held it axiomatic that as man lost his intuition and belief in immortality, he also lost his zest for life, his humaneness. However, it is not a simple task to define the meaning of immortality for Jurij Živago. He has the fundamental intuition about immortality in his zest for life; the intensity of life's pulsations the reader feels with the protagonist. As Grigorieff noted, Živago's love of life is akin to Ivan Karamazov's,¹⁵ but even more, I should say, to Dmitrij Karamazov's love for life.

Cognitively, as a young medical student, Jurij first defined immortality in the sense of living in others, in memory and through other beings. To the dying Anna Ivanovna he said: "You in others—this is your soul. This is what you are. This is what your consciousness has breathed and lived on and enjoyed throughout your life—your soul, your immortality, your life in others. . . . There is no such thing as death. Death has nothing to do with us."¹⁶ As St. John said, the past is over and the new thing is "life eternal."¹⁷

Jurij Živago's heady sense of life, his enthusiasm and being caught up by the beauty of life which he finds almost impossible to articulate in the novel, ties him all the more

closely to the earth and to people. This tie in exuberant love and with stark compassion radiates in his lines from "Dawn":

My heart goes out to each and all,
To everyone who feels he's down;...
As wives, as children, or as trees,
These people are a part of me:
They rule my life, and by that sign
I know my sole true victory.¹⁸

Dostoevskij had observed the fundamental fact that a man's sense of immortality ties him all the closer to life, to the earth, and to one's fellowman.

In the largest sense, Pasternak's novel itself is suffused with this understanding of man. The work is a monument to every particular Russian who struggled, suffered, died, or lived through the wars and the revolutionary period. No one can readily forget the story of Pamfil Palyx and his crazed fear, or the terror that young Tanja lived through as a child. There are many vivid and unforgettable encounters written with a stark simplicity of phrase and which evoke a vigorous compassion.

Years later, as a mature and experienced man, Jurij Živago's youthful and easy confidence changed. He pondered the question of immortality more deeply. It was out of the experience of love which displaced his own ego that he was prompted to ask:

For who are we, and whence,
If their idle talk alone
Lives long in aftertime
When we no longer live?

That he went beyond this to a clear belief in the Christian sense of eternal life can be sustained from Živago's religious poems. (It is significant that all of them are specifically New Testament.) In "The Miracle" he wrote:

But a miracle is a sign—an act of God.
In days of confusion, at a call unforeseen,
We stand, unprepared, before God our Lord.

The resurrection to eternal life theme recurs again and again in his poems: in the promise of "Holy Week": "Death itself

shall be destroyed / By the power of the Resurrection" ; the raising of Lazarus in the poem "Evil Days" ; in Mary Magdalene's reminiscences; in Christ's words: "I will suffer death and on the third day rise again" from "The Garden of Gethsemane."

All Živago's poems articulate clearly and simply that which is in complexity developed in the entire work—compassion. The overarching theme is the consummation in life —sobornost'—the abiding felt communion of man with man, and man with nature. There is the magnificent description of the spring thaw which radiates this understanding of nature:

At first the snow thawed quietly and secretly from within. But by the time half the gigantic labor was done it could not be hidden any longer and the miracle became visible. Waters came rushing out from below with a roar. The forest stirred in its impenetrable depth, and everything in it awoke.

There was plenty of room for the water to play. It flung itself down the rocks, filled every pool to overflowing, and spread. It roared and smoked and steamed in the forest. It streaked through the woods, bogging down the snow that tried to hinder its movement, it ran hissing on level ground or hurtled down and scattered into a fine spray. The earth was saturated. Ancient pines perched on dizzy heights drank the moisture almost from the clouds, and it foamed and dried a rusty white at their roots like beer foam on a mustache.

The sky, drunk with spring and giddy with its fumes, thickened with clouds. Low clouds, drooping at the edges like felt, sailed over the woods and rain leapt from them, warm, smelling of soil and sweat, and washing the last of the black armor-plating of ice from the earth.¹⁹

And in the words of Larisa one finds the longing and knowledge of real communion:

... if by some miracle, somewhere I could see the window of our house shining, the lamplight on Pasha's desk and his books—even if it were at the end of the earth—I would crawl to it on my knees. Everything in me would respond. I could never hold out against the call of the past, of loyalty. There is nothing I wouldn't sacrifice, however precious. Even you. Even our love, so carefree, so spontaneous, so natural. . . . Isn't the same call of duty that drives you back to Tonja?²⁰

Larisa is not speaking of duty for duty's sake in any Puritanic ethic. She refers to the underlying communion of family which is wrought out creatively and sacrificially by two people.

Parallel to the personal life and death of the individual is the problem of the politico-social or existential community of men. As a young doctor, Jurij Živago was idealistically positive and hopeful in the exhilarating sense about the socialist revolution in Russia: "I too think that Russia is destined to become the first socialist state since the beginning of the world."²¹ He is at this time quite impersonal about the "sea of blood," the killing and dying, for he thinks that his vision goes beyond the immediate to the ideal, to the "end." But it is precisely his immediate and continual participation throughout the years of revolution that forces him to alter his naive and youthful idealism. Živago's conversation with the Marxist, Samdevjatov, is significant; it shows how far he has moved from naive idealism:

Marxism a science? Well, it's taking a risk, to say the least, to argue about that with a man one hardly knows. However—Marxism is too uncertain of its ground to be a science. Sciences are more balanced, more objective. I don't know a movement more self-centered and further removed from the facts than Marxism. Everyone is worried only about proving himself in practical matters, and as for the men in power, they are so anxious to establish the myth of their infallibility that they do their utmost to ignore the truth. Politics doesn't appeal to me. I don't like people who don't care about the truth.²²

After the years spent with the Forest Brotherhood, witnessing the civil revolution, and upon his return to Yuriatin, there is not doubt as to Živago's position. The illusion, the unreality of life under the "soviets" is evident:

What an enviable blindness! . . . to be able to talk of bread when it has long since vanished from the face of the earth! Of propertied classes and speculators when they have long since been abolished by earlier decrees! Of peasants and villages that no longer exist! Don't they remember their own plans and measures, which long since turned life upside down? What kind of people are they, to go on raving with this never-cooling, feverish ardor, year in, year out, on nonexistent long-vanished subjects, and to know nothing, to see nothing around them.²³

Only once in his life had their uncompromising language and their single-mindedness filled him with enthusiasm. Must be pay for that rash enthusiasm all his life, he asked himself.

It is passages like the following which radiate a peace and joy of life which separate Živago from his contemporaries. From the poem "March" the verse:

The earth is steaming, drenched in sweat;
Ravines run dazed and turbulent.
Like a bustling milkmaid hard at work,
Spring labors long, is well-content.

From "Summer in the City" the verses:

When morning flames out
In a blaze again,
When the sun dries clean
The puddles of rain,

The lindens awaken
To a freshness deep,
Awaken sweet-scented
And heavy with sleep.

In the poem "Earth":

Spring rushes like a roaring tide
Even in exclusive Moscow homes.

White night and sunset by the river
Just cannot keep apart in passing.

And from "Star of the Nativity":

One star alone and shy
That shone on the road to Bethlehem.

At times it looked like a hayrack aflame,
Apart from God and the sky;
Like a barn on fire,
Like a farmstead ablaze in the night.

It reared in the sky like a flaming stack
Of straw and hay,
In the midst of a Creation
Amazed by this new star in the world.

Then these delicate lines from the same poem; the mother and child:

The Magi remained in the twilight cave;
They whispered softly, groping for words.
Then someone in darkness touched the arm
Of one near the manger, to move him aside:
Behold, like a guest above the threshold,
The Star of the Nativity gazed on the Maid.

Time and again Živago returned to nature for harmony, serenity, and balance. The beauty of the unshakeable laws of the universe filled him with respect and awe. The eternal beauty and life of nature—the magnificent immanence of its immutable harmony and order is Živago's early aesthetics. But the artist to whom Art is expressive of the content of life is not content. Where is justice? What happens to all that is concrete and individual? The moral point of view forced itself upon Jurij. He did not, however, despair or resign himself to words like Heraclitus: "The most beautiful Universe is comparable to a heap of rubbish scattered about at random." On the contrary, Živago's final affirmation is grounded in the New Testament view of Life. His disillusionment with man's socialistic utopia had come in the midst of his experience with its beginnings, and for Živago, the concrete personal and human in joys and in sorrows showed the inadequacies and absurdities of any naturalistic view of man. The only victory over death and destruction lies with the way of "the highest emblem for mankind—the prophet who sacrificed himself."²⁴

Živago wrote rightly (and about himself as well):

Every man is born a Faust, with a longing to grasp and experience and express everything in the world. Faust became a scientist thanks to the mistakes of his predecessors and contemporaries. Progress in science is governed by the laws of repulsion, every step forward is made by refutation of prevalent errors and false theories. Faust was an artist thanks to the inspiring example of his teachers. Forward steps in art are governed by the law of attraction, are the result of the imitation of and admiration for beloved predecessors.²⁵

Tired of the socialist revolutionaries' high-flown rhetoric, he felt artistically akin to the "childlike Russian quality of Puškin and Čexov, their modest reticence in such high-sounding matters as the ultimate purpose of mankind or their own salvation."²⁶ The restless quality of Gogol', Tolstoj, and

Dostoevskij he could not fully appreciate or understand. And indeed, it takes a lifetime for Jurij Živago to penetrate into the real meaning and significance of Dostoevskij's The Possessed. Pasternak did not "mould" Živago and create a martyr; rather the hero follows his own inclinations and insights. Perhaps Živago's insights did not "fail him" but, on the contrary, sustained him. He is, in plain words, a sinner, and his heroism and courage lies in the fact that in affirming Christianity, he knew it judged him also. Pasternak is, of course, greater than his hero, although one knows his sympathy for Živago.

In conclusion, there are two planes in Doktor Živago; the protagonist moves from one to the other in both the personal and social relationships of life. For the individual and immortality, Živago first held the idealistic position of immortality as memory; he moved to the position of a "higher realism" in resurrection in the Christian sense. For the community of man, which opens the problem of justice, young Živago's idealism led him to accept first the socialist-Marxist view. He ultimately grasped the higher realism in sobornost' or the inward, spiritual communion which is grounded in love, and love in the exact sense of the "prophet who sacrificed Himself." His final affirmation, and the author's, is both a judgment and a promise. In the poem "Garden of Gethsemane":

The passing of an age is like a parable,
And in the passing it will burst in flame.
In the name of its awful splendor I will,
In my volutary passion, suffer death.

I will suffer death and on the third day rise
Again. Like rafts descending on a river,
Like a caravan of sails, the centuries
Out of the night will come to my judgment seat.

Within Christianity lies the mystery of the individual, and its new way of living is "born of the heart."²⁷ With the Galilean who appeared in the midst of the "tasteless heap of gold and marble" which was the Roman Empire, man came into being. The life and symbol of the Galilean is the "beauty which will save and transform the world" of Dostoevskij. Pasternak, again, reaffirms.²⁸

Notes

1. Nikolai Gogol, Dead Souls, tr. by George Reavey (London, 1948), p. 161.
2. Dmitry Felix Grigorieff, "Pasternak and Dostoevskij," Slavic and East European Journal, XVII (1959), 335.
3. Herbert Bowman, "Dr. Živago," Northwest Review (Spring 1959), p. 67.
4. The term "realism" here is used in the sense of the author catching the actuality of peoples' lives, i. e., what is rather than what should be. However, realism is not limited to the "naturalistic" school of literary criticism, but includes the dimension of the spiritual in the specific religious sense. Dostoevskij, I think, has made the careful distinction here with his phrase "higher realism."
5. Walter Vickery, "Symbolism Aside: Dr. Živago," SE EJ, XVII (1959), 343-348.
6. Robert L. Jackson, "Doktor Živago and the Living Tradition," SE EJ, IV (XVIII) (1960), 103-118. See also Thomas Merton, "Boris Pasternak and the People with Watch Chains," Jubilee (July, 1959), pp. 19-31.
7. Boris Pasternak, Doktor Živago, tr. by Max Hayward and Manya Harari (New York: Pantheon, 1958), p. 518.
8. Dantia Broggi, "Viereck Discusses Pasternak as Society's Unadjusted Man," Mount Holyoke News, November 14, 1958, p. 3.
9. Vladimir Šajković, Lectures on Russian Literature, unpublished.
10. Edmund Wilson, New Yorker, November 15, 1958.
11. Ibid.
12. Fyodor Dostoevskij, The Diary of a Writer, tr. by Boris Brasol, (New York, 1954), I, 540.
13. Pasternak, Doktor Živago, p. 68.
14. Dostoevskij, p. 542.
15. Grigorieff, p. 339.
16. Pasternak, p. 67. It is significant that the novel opens with the burial of ten-year old Jurij's mother, and the song "Rest Eternal." The last words of the novel belong to Christ as he speaks about his resurrection.
17. Ibid.
18. Eugene M. Kayden, Poems by Boris Pasternak (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1959), p. 158. All succeeding quotations from poems are taken from this work.
19. Pasternak, p. 233.
20. Ibid., p. 403.

21. Pasternak, p. 182.
22. Ibid., p. 259.
23. Ibid., p. 381.
24. Ibid., p. 42.
25. Ibid., p. 284.
26. Ibid., p. 285.
27. Ibid., p. 122.
28. Ibid., pp. 42-43.

ASPECT AND TENSE IN RUSSIAN

By V. Terras

University of Illinois

There have been many attempts to define the Russian verbal aspects, or at least to describe them in a way that would be both concise and complete.¹ Although the realization of the inherent asymmetry of this morphological correlation² has made this task somewhat easier, the picture is still far from clear. Recently the trend has been toward acceptance of the perfective aspect as the "marked" correlative of a true morphological correlation.³ In the past, numerous efforts have been made to subdivide each aspect, especially the perfective, into subcategories, so that the correlation perfective : imperfective would appear to be a logical abstraction more than an expression of grammatical fact. In the following, it will be taken for granted that the aspect is a general category of the Russian verb, i. e., every verbal form in a live context is, at least in principle, either perfective or imperfective.

The majority of all Russian verbs are members of a "linear pair," i. e. a pair of verbs which differ in their aspect only, and which, in effect, are considered to be one verb by many grammarians. Given such a pair, the perfective, as a rule, can be distinguished from the imperfective verb by formal criteria. The morphological details are, however, quite complicated. Thus, a verbal prefix perfectivates an imperfective verb, but not the indeterminate forms of "double imperfectives." According to Regnell⁴ and other authors, these verbs have to be understood as "second imperfectives" of the respective perfective forms, i. e., there is a correlation prinesu : prinošu, but none of the type nošu : prinošu. Or, the suffix -nu / -ne is, in modern Russian as well as in the past, a genuine perfective suffix, but a number of imperfective verbs also have it. These verbs are apparently back formations from prefixed forms, e. g., gasnut' from pogasnut'

Modern Russian has only one productive imperfective suffix, -yva (-iva). The older suffixes -va, -ja, and -a are unproductive. As a result, many derived imperfectives are not immediately recognizable as such, e.g., uznavat', uverjat', pokupat' can be classed as imperfectives only if we know their perfective equivalents.

In some cases the aspect correlation is expressed by lexical means, e.g., lovit' : pojmat'.

A number of verbs are used as both perfectives and imperfectives, a fact speaking in favor of the conception according to which the perfective and imperfective forms of a linear pair are really one verb. The productive group of verbs in -ovat' belongs here. However, there seems to be a tendency to perfectivate these verbs by means of a "préverbe vide," e.g., organizovat' : sorganizovat'.

A considerable number of verbs are perfectiva and imperfectiva tantum, e.g., očnut'sja, očutit'sja, rexnut'sja appear as perfectives only, preobladat', bezdejstvovat', opasat'sja have imperfective forms only.

In modern literary Russian, the iterative verbs have been, aside of a few non-systemic exceptions, integrated into the dual aspect system.⁶ Old Russian texts as well as modern Russian dialects show authentic iterative forms derived from perfective, and from imperfective verbs. Clearly, such verbs as pivat', bivat', pekat' do not fit into what we understand to be the Russian aspect system, but represent a special grammatical subcategory.

In the following we shall disregard the above-mentioned and other facts which can be considered non-systemic, and concentrate on the aspect relations as they appear in linear pairs.

We shall now describe the functions of the aspect category as they appear in the different forms of the finite and infinite verb. Meillet⁷ pointed out that the forms in which no confusion of the tense and aspect categories was possible should serve as the principal testing ground for inquiries into the nature of the verbal aspects. Such forms are the infinitive, the imperative, and the supine, the last being no longer present in Russian. We shall begin our description with these forms.

The Infinitive.

If we compare the perfective and imperfective forms of different pairs of verbs, we see that the functional distinction is not the same in every case, but that, on the other hand, there is always some distinction between them: In modern Russian, no perfective verb can be connected with the verbs načat', stat', prodolžat', končit', brosit' and other verbs which semantically imply duration.⁸ It is interesting to note that Vaillant⁹ considers this syntactical trait to be the most reliable criterion of the imperfective, as against the perfective aspect, in Old Church Slavic. Thus, all perfective infinitives form a set, as against all imperfective infinitives. In this respect, the various subdivisions of the perfective aspect function alike: the semelfactive stuknut', the determinative posidet', and the inceptive zakričat' all have the common property of absolute incompatibility with a verb implying duration.

On the other hand, the different subdivisions of the perfective aspect are quite real. In each of them, the indeterminate action suggested by the lexical meaning of the imperfective verb is determined in a specific fashion. In fact, the terms determinate and indeterminate fit the true nature of the aspect category—as it appears here, that is, in the infinitive—much better than the terms perfective and imperfective.¹⁰ One may speak of the following types of correlation:

(1) The distinction between the perfective and the imperfective form is largely lexical, i. e., it does not follow a common functional pattern, e. g., ljubit' : poljubit' (the meaning "to grow fond of" is not the one we might expect).

(2) The distinction is lexico-grammatical, i. e., whereas the lexical meaning of the two verbs is different, such distinction follows a set pattern, e. g., govorit' : zgovorit' (inceptive); kušat' : pokušat' (determinative); vzdyxat' : vzdoxnut' (semelfactive).

(3) The distinction is strictly grammatical, i. e., it amounts to the difference in aspect. This is the case in what we call "linear pairs," e. g. načat' : načinat' ; doigrat' : doigryvat', etc.

As to the linear pairs, the question must be raised whether the relation of perfective to imperfective infinitive is always the same, quite regardless of whether the correlation belongs to the types primary imperfective : prefixed

perfective, primary perfective : 2nd imperfective with unproductive suffix, or prefixed perfective : 2nd imperfective with productive (or unproductive) suffix. I think that the pairs primary imperfective : perfective "au préverbe vide"¹¹ should not be considered on a par with the pairs perfective : 2nd imperfective, as is done by many authors. The fact is that, in a majority of all cases, the "préverbe vide" has a trace of lexical meaning left. Vaillant's statement, "... et il subsiste toujours le sentiment confus que le préverbe veut dire quelque chose, même quand on ne peut préciser quoi,"¹² is true of modern Russian just as much as of OCS. It must be also noted that, whereas a variety of prefixes have functioned, or still function as "préverbes vides" in OCS, OR, and modern Russian, none of them has ever gained anything close to a monopoly of that field—which could have been expected if these were truly grammatical morphemes, without a trace of lexical meaning. There is a trend in modern Russian, particularly evident in loanwords and neologisms, to use the prefixes po-, za-, o-, s-, and some others, as a strictly grammatical mark of the perfective aspect. But I think that such procedure is not as generally valid as that by which an imperfective can be formed from a given perfective, e.g., zatormaživat' from zatormozit'. Also, whereas we have a variety of prefixes acting as "préverbe vide," modern Russian has only one productive suffix of imperfectivization.

The above implies that, whereas perfectivization by means of a prefix is always, to a certain extent, a lexical phenomenon, and the perfective suffix -nu / -ne has a specific, momentative or semelfactive meaning, imperfectivization results in an almost purely "grammatical" correlation. I said "almost" because, in some cases, 2nd imperfectives (especially those in -yva / -iva) may display an apparent associative connection with the iteratives, provided the speaker is aware of the latter category.

Furthermore, as Karcewski first pointed out, perfectivization brings along secondary grammatical effects, such as the change from intransitive to transitive.¹³ Second imperfectives, on the other hand, retain the lexical and syntactic features of the perfective.

To recapitulate: The distinction between a perfective and an imperfective infinitive indicates a distinction between determinate and indeterminate action. The perfective form

is, if we disregard those infinitives which have an iterative meaning, the marked one, regardless of whether it is "primary" or "secondary." The nature and degree of determinateness, however, varies greatly. In some types of correlation, it can be clearly defined, either lexically (ljubit' : poljubit'), or grammatically (govorit' : zagovorit'). Our difficulties start only with the linear pairs where the determinateness of the perfective form is quite abstract. The difference between prošu načat' and prošu načinat', or that between prošu doigrat' nezakončennye partii and prošu doigryvat' nezakončennye partii is hard to define. The reason for this difficulty is, it would seem, the following: An existing formal correlation which is not tied to a definite syntactic, or to a specific conceptual function, cannot fail to become an instrument in the hands of the stylist. It is precisely in those cases where a formal correlation has no definite content that a variety of subtle nuances can be suggested, rather than expressed, by the speaker. The distinction between perfective and imperfective forms in the infinitive of linear pairs is such a correlation. The difficulties of grammarians in defining the function of the aspect correlation in linear pairs is simply the difficulty one is bound to face when trying to express stylistic observations in rational terms.

One of the stylistic functions of this correlation is that of emphasis. For instance, the emphatic use of the imperfective aspect in the imperative, but especially in the prohibitive infinitive is analogous to a similar usage in the imperative, e.g., ètomu ne byvat' (more emphatic than the perfective form). Also in negative clauses, e.g., "Da čto, Mar'ja Vasil'evna, osmeljus' doložit'-s, predprinimat' tut nečego-s, kak tol'ko vnesti vseju polnost'ju summu-s." (A.N. Plesčeev, Žitejskie sceny.)

In the imperative, the use of the imperfective aspect after a negation has been "grammaticalized." It is also apparently developing in the same direction in the infinitive. Thus, the answer to the optional pustit' ego? / puskat' ego? is normally ne puskat'! rather than ne pustit'! However, the speaker still has a choice, the imperfective form being the more emphatic.

A description of the stylistic use of the aspects is beyond the scope of this paper. I shall give only one example to indicate the nature of it: Esenin's famous last words, "V ètoj

žizni umirat' ne novo, / No i žit', konečno, ne novej," were thus paraphrased by Majakovskij: "V ètoj žizni pomeret' ne trudno. / Sdelat' žizn' značitel'no trudnej." What makes it even more interesting is that Majakovskij in his article "Kak delat' stixi?" quotes himself thus: "V ètoj žizni pomirat' ne trudno, / Sdelat' žizn' značitel'no trudnej." Naturally, the perfective pomet', as against the imperfective umirat', has a definite stylistic function. The perfective form takes something away from the pathos of the original, which the replacement of the prefix u- by po- also does. It makes "dying" appear less important.

We could then distinguish the following types of use for the correlation perfective : imperfective in infinitives of linear pairs: (1) The aspect is determined by the syntactical constellation, e.g., after verbs which rule an imperfective infinitive; (2) the aspect is determined by stylistic considerations, as in the example just quoted; (3) the aspect is functionless, e.g., in a phrase like nu čto, načinat'? / nu čto, načat'?

The Imperative.

Here, as in the infinitive, a syntactical criterion exists by which the aspects can be distinguished: The negative (prohibitive) imperative is predominantly imperfective. Whenever the negative imperative of a perfective verb is used, it has the specific meaning of a warning. Šaxmatov considered this feature to be one of the (altogether six) functional criteria by which the perfective can be distinguished from the imperfective aspect. For instance, "go!" could be ujдите! or uxodite! But "don't go" is always ne uxodite! And ne upadi! means "watch your step!" Another example: ne ubej ego means "careful, you may kill him!"

It is interesting to note that such usage has exact parallels in other IE languages. Thus, in classical Armenian, the imperative of the present is always prohibitive, whereas the imperative of the aorist is not. The relation of presential to aoristic aspect (or better, "Aktions-art") is roughly that of indeterminate to determinate forms in other IE languages, such as classical Greek. In classical, as well as in Homeric Greek, only the present imperative (with $\mu\eta$) is used in negative and prohibitive phrases. It appears that the rather rare exceptions in which the aorist imperative does appear after $\mu\eta$ are of the same type as the

respective usage in Russian. This striking parallel was recognized early.¹⁴ Greek grammarians generally explain this peculiarity as we should like to explain the Slavic equivalent: A prohibition seldom refers to a determinate event, but covers a number of possibilities. If a determinate event is thought of (as in a warning), the determinate form may be used.

We see then that a feature which is typical of the correlation determinate : indeterminate in Greek and Armenian appears as a feature of the correlation perfective : imperfective in the Slavic languages. It seems that, in Russian, the determinate forms of double imperfectives are also but rarely used with the negative, although such usage is not ungrammatical.

Only perfective verbs have, according to Šaxmatov and others, an imperative of the 1st person plural, e.g., pojďemte, vypjĕmte etc. Again, it can be noted that the determinate forms of double imperfectives do permit this form, e.g., idĕmte.

Interestingly, such syntax of the imperative may be a feature which has only relatively recently developed. According to Vaillant, the negative imperative is more often perfective than not in OCS.¹⁵ The question is whether Vaillant's observation is entirely correct. Since no colloquial texts are available, the number of imperatives in the OCS texts is rather small, and many of them (e.g., the negative ones of the ten commandments) may be understood as belonging to the special case of "warning."

Otherwise the distinction between perfective and imperfective imperative is the same as observed in the infinitive: The imperfective is the unmarked indeterminate form, and the perfective is the marked determinate form. In many instances the nature of determinateness is vague, approaching the limit of "grammaticalization." Thus, pojmi že! and ponimaj že! or daj! and davaj! are hard to distinguish semantically. However, the distinction becomes clearer when the imperative is placed into a specific syntactic context. For instance, pojmi že menja rather than ponimaj že menja.

It appears that aspect correlation can also be used stylistically in the imperative. It would seem that, in the case of linear pairs, the imperfective imperative is the

more emphatic, e.g., ubirajsja otsjuda! as against uberis' otsjuda! or davaj časy! as against daj časy! or snimaj pal'to! as against snimi pal'to!

The Present-Future.

The function of aspect correlation is more complex here than it is in the infinitive or in the imperative.

In modern Russian, the present of an imperfective verb has the function of a present tense, and is correlated to the periphrastic future formed by means of the auxiliary budu, budeš', etc. Its frequent use as a praesens historicum, its occasional future function, as well as its use in statements of general validity are plainly secondary functions which are non-systemically derived from the basic function of an indeterminate present.

The present of a perfective verb has, especially in the main clause, normally a future meaning. Contrary to Vinogradov,¹⁶ and other authors, I should say that the pairs of the type sprošu : sprašivaju do form a correlation, the present being the marked form.

There is no doubt that, historically, the use of the perfective present in lieu of a future is but a special case of perfective (determinate) action.¹⁷ Older scholars seem to have taken it for granted that it directly replaced the older -s- future.¹⁸ However, synchronically, the relation between ja vas sprošu and ja vas sprašivaju, or between ja doigraju partiju and ja doigryvaju partiju is, in most cases of actual usage, quite different from that between sprosit' and sprašivat' or between doigrat' and doigryvat'. The contradiction between the fact that the perfective form is marked in the infinitive and in the imperative, but may appear as the unmarked form in the present : future, is explained by the fact that the relation is not the same at all in both cases. A priori, there ought to be no reason why a present could not be a marked form.¹⁹

There remains the question how to integrate the cases where the perfective present does not have a future meaning into the Russian verbal system. These cases are:

(1) In subordinate clauses, the present of a perfective verb can function as a present, as well as a preterit, in addition to its future function, e.g., ona bednaja vdova, živet tol'ko tem, čto s doma polučit (Gončarov, Oblomov). Načal tatar pokolačitvat' / Maxnët rukoj—ulica / Otmaxnët nazad—pereuloček (Bylina).

(2) As a praesens historicum, e.g., Protopopica bednaja bredët, bredët, da i povalitsja... (Avvakum, Žitie).

(3) As a resultative, e.g., "... i moljus', i moljus' do toj pory, poka vladyčica ne posmotrit na menja s ikony ljubovnee." (Dostoevskij, Xozjajka).

(4) In negative clauses of the type "Tišina, ne ševel'nětsja ni odin list." (Čexov, Skučnaja istorija).

In the above cases, it appears that we are dealing with a genuine determinate present. In the following cases, where no future meaning is in evidence, either, we may, apparently, see a metaphoric use of the future:

(1) General statements, such as proverbs, e.g., prošlogo ne vorotiš'. It can be noted that languages which have a genuine future tense often use it in such cases, for instance, Lith. Kàs vòks ne-pralòps "He who steals won't get rich."

(2) Certain standard phrases such as ja už poprošu vas.

(3) Categorical statements, e.g., "A v našem gorode sejčas iz vsego sdelajut prestuplenie." (F. Sologub, Melkij bes).

(4) Various shades of indefiniteness, hesitation, and polite restraint are expressed by the use of the perfective present, e.g., "A kto ž takaja budete?" sprošila Tat'jana. (Turgenev, Nov').

Apparently, we have, in the present / future system, a case of incomplete "grammaticalization."²⁰ The perfective present functions, depending upon the context, as either a determinate present, or as a future. In the former case, its relation to the imperfective present is equivalent to the relation between perfective and an imperfective infinitive. In the latter, it is of an entirely different order. The distinction between a determinate and an indeterminate present is used stylistically in the above quoted cases where the perfective present does not have a future meaning. It is used grammatically when it does.

The Preterit.

In the preterit, too, we fail to find the relations which we should expect to exist on the basis of the facts observed in connection with infinitive and imperative.

The imperfective preterit has the following basic function:

(1) It is an unmarked preterital form, e.g., "Čaju? A

čto ž, razve vypit' eščē stakančik?"—"Net, ne xoču."—Razve už pil gde-nibud'?"—"Da eščē kakoj čaj-to pil!" (Pleščeev, Žitejskie sceny.)

(2) It acts as a perfectum praesens, i. e., it expresses an event of the past, the effect of which extends into the present, e. g., "Ty literaturen, ty čital, ty umeeš' vosxiščat'-sja." (Dostoevskij, Podrostok).

(3) It acts as a marked durative, or iterative imperfect, e. g., "Kak teper' pomnju utro, v kotoroe my perebiralis' s Peterburgskoj storony na Vasil'evskij ostrov." (Dostoevskij, Bednye ljudi.) Or "Nikogda, naprimer, on ne pozvoljal sebe s'est' vsego obeda, predlagaemogo každydneno Ustin'ej Fëdorovnoj ego tovariščam. Obed stoil poltinu; Semën Ivanovič upotrebljal tol'ko dvadcat' pjat' kopeek med'ju i nikogda ne voxodil vyše..." (Dostoevskij, Gospodin Proxarčín).

The perfective preterit, on the other hand, has these functions:

(1) It is a marked preterital form, denoting an event which either began, or ended in the past, e. g., on vypil dva stakana, or on zapil.

(2) It acts as a perfectum praesens, e. g., propali naši golovuški.

(3) It is an unmarked preterital form, e. g. Gorodničij potrepal ego po pleču, poželal ot duši uspeha i otpravilsja domoj. (V. A. Sollogub, Sabačka.)

Such a condition can be understood only as essentially a reflection of the Old Russian (and OCS) tense system.²¹ The imperfective preterit reflects the functions of the OR imperfect, perfective as well as imperfective. Thus, iterative perfective (determinate) action, for which the imperfect of a perfective verb would have appeared in OR, is expressed by the imperfective preterit in modern Russian. The OR imperfect was "marked" with regard to the aorist, and so the imperfective preterit seems to appear as a "marked" form in modern Russian, whenever it has that function.

Similarly, the perfective preterit is not necessarily a marked form, but may act as an unmarked narrative preterit, equivalent to the—also unmarked—OR aorist.

It is also to be noted that the Russian preterit, perfective as well as imperfective, has retained its original function of a perfectum praesens, a form which in OR was neutral as far as aspect is concerned.

The above-described functional distribution in modern Russian indicates that, at the point when the OR perfect (a "marked" form!) began to be used as an unmarked preterit as well, aspect and tense relations were still being kept apart, as far as aorist and perfective aspect were concerned. The aoristic use of the imperfective preterit in modern Russian indicates that imperfective aorists must have been in use at the time. On the other hand, the imperfect and the imperfective aspect seem to have become tied together before the perfect replaced the old imperfect. Such an assumption is corroborated by historical evidence.²²

Our assumption that there exists a continuity between the functional system of the modern Russian preterit and the OR tense system is made plausible by the fact that the OR texts of even the oldest specimens of Muscovite literature show essentially the same situation as modern Russian. Interestingly, there is no record of a transitional stage from the old to the new system, i. e., texts in which aorist and imperfect, on one hand, and the -l perfect, on the other, would be used indiscriminately. As to the texts in which there is a semblance of such indiscriminate usage, it appears that it is due to errors on the part of the author, or of a scribe, rather than to its reflecting the actual condition of live speech.

Participles and Gerunds.

It is generally understood that all four participles are, in modern as well as in OR, loans from OCS. There is no record of a state of the Russian language in which the participles were used as in OCS, or as in literary Russian. Genuinely Russian participial forms are preserved in verbal adjectives such as gorjačij, ljubimyj, usopšij, prokljatyj, as well as in the gerunds.²³

Numerous examples given by Obnorskij show that the past gerund in -v, -vši, -mši, etc., can be formed from both perfective and imperfective verbs, although the former are much more frequent. Still there can be no doubt as to the regularity of such forms of guljavši, bravši, evši. The verbal adjectives corresponding to the old past passive participle can be formed from both perfective and imperfective verbs. The same is true of the past participles, active as well as passive, of literary Russian: Although perfective forms are much more frequent, imperfective forms cannot be considered to be irregular.

The gerund in -uči is, even in the dialects, an isolated form. It appears that, all through the Muscovite period, it is a form used in specific expressions only, e. g., žit' pripevajuči. It is normally formed from imperfective verbs, but "mistakes" are frequent.

The gerund in -ja is a problem in itself. In older Muscovite texts (e. g., Avvakum's Žitie, Povest' ob Azovskom osadnom sidenii, Ivan the Terrible's letters to Kurbskij), it is formed with regularity from both perfective and imperfective verbs. Also, modern Russian writers have numerous perfective forms, although the imperfective ones prevail. According to Obnorskij,²⁴ such a condition is a result of the conflict between tense and aspect. If I understand Obnorskij rightly, this means that, since the "aspect label" is pronounced enough to distinguish the gerunds of, say, stavit' and postavit', the tense label can be dropped as redundant, so that, instead of stavja and postaviv, we get stavja and postavja. The matter is, however, complicated by the fact that, in all of the texts in which the -ja gerund is used in this fashion, the gerund in -v (ši) is also used, and that it is also formed from both perfective and imperfective verbs.²⁵ Perhaps it is correct to say that the -ja gerund is neutral as far as tense is concerned, whereas the -v (ši) gerund is a past form.

The tendency of modern literary Russian to form a present participle from imperfective verbs only, continues a like tendency of OCS. However, whereas in OCS and in OR perfective forms seem to have been not irregular, being quite frequent in the usage of some texts, the Codex Suprasliensis for instance, they are now felt to be "ungrammatical." The present passive participle is, already in OCS, on its way to becoming a verbal adjective designating aptitude. Both perfective and imperfective forms appear, the perfective being rather more common in the negative. Modern Russian shows practically the same picture.

It is difficult to establish any particular trend in the relation of the tense and aspect categories in the participles and gerunds. The fact that the perfective present participles have not developed into future participles indicates that the development of the present participle and gerund has been independent from that of the finite forms. On the other hand, there is the decided trend in modern Russian to identify the present participle (and, in part, the present gerund) with the imperfective aspect. In the past participles and gerund,

a similar trend to identify these with the perfective aspect exists, but in a much weaker form.

Synopsis.

I agree completely with Kurylowicz²⁶ that an authentic aspect correlation appears, in the modern Slavic languages, and in Russian in particular, only on the periphery of the verbal system. I should say that only in the infinitive and in the imperative, as well as to a certain extent in the participles, the aspect correlation has retained its proto-Slavic character. Here it is still basically what Indo-European scholars call a determinate : indeterminate correlation. It must be noted that, although the Slavic perfective : imperfective correlation is functionally close to the determinate : indeterminate correlation in other IE languages, there is no historical connection between them.

In the finite system of the Slavic verb, and the Russian verb in particular, the existing formal correlation of functionally determinate : indeterminate verbal forms has been harnessed to serve in a quite different capacity. In the present/future system, it was "grammaticalized" early, perhaps at the proto-Slavic stage. In the preterit system, each Slavic language has gone its own way. In Russian, the old distinction between aorist and imperfect has been identified with the aspect correlation. The whole development is a fine example of morphological syncretism.

Notes

1. See, for instance, V. V. Vinogradov, Russkij jazyk (Moskva, 1947), or, for more recent literature, Rudolf Ruzicka, Der Verbalaspekt in der altrussischen Nestorchronik (Berlin, 1957).

2. See Roman Jakobson, Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums, (Prague: Charisteria Mathesio, 1932), pp. 74-84.

3. See, e.g., James Ferrell, "The Meaning of the Perfective Aspect in Russian," Word, VII (1951), 104-135.

4. C. G. Regnell, Über den Ursprung des slavischen Verbalaspekts (Lund, 1944), p. 61.

5. See Regnell, pp. 78-80.

6. Such pairs as žit' - živat', znat' - znavat', vidat' - vidyvat' are dying out, and are certainly unproductive. The only form of these verbs still in use is the preterit, which, accordingly, ought to be considered a form of the primary verb, i. e., sižival is a form of sidet', not of *siživat'. See Vinogradov, p. 502.

7. A. Meillet, Le Slave commun (Paris, 1924), p. 243.
8. For details see, e.g., S. Karcevski, Remarques sur la psychologie des aspects en russe, (Geneva: Mélanges Bally, 1939), p. 236.
9. André Vaillant, Manuel du Vieux slave (Paris, 1948), p. 329.
10. Vinogradov is of this opinion. He mentions that M. N. Katkov used these terms long ago.
11. A. Meillet's term.
12. Op. cit., p. 320.
13. Op. cit., p. 234.
14. I found references to earlier works on this subject in Raphael Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, (2nd ed., Hannover, 1870), II, 203.
15. Op. cit., p. 329.
16. Op. cit., p. 574.
17. It must be noted, however, that J. Kurylowicz, "Réflexions sur l'imparfait et les aspects en vieux slave," International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, I-II (1959), pp. 5-6, expresses himself as against this view.
18. E.g., W. Vondrák, Vergleichende slavische Grammatik, (Göttingen, 1908) II, 187.
19. Modern Persian, for instance, has a marked (usually durative) present, formed by the prefix mi-.
20. To clarify what I mean by this, I shall give another example: In colloquial German, the "Hilfsverb des Modus" wollen forms a future. However, not in all cases does it have such function. For instance, ich will hingehen may mean "I'll go there," or "I want to go there," depending upon whether the accent is on hingehen, or on will. In English, the grammaticalization of this form is complete.
21. For a description of same see C. H. Van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System ('S-Gravenhage, 1959).
22. P. S. Kuznecov, Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1953), p. 230, mentions the fact that in several copies of the Russian Povest' vremennyx let many original perfective imperfections were replaced by their imperfective equivalents by later scribes.
23. S. P. Obnorskij, Očerki po morfologii russkogo glagola (Moskva, 1953), p. 217.
24. Op. cit., p. 222.
25. Avvakum, for instance, has pokinja, ograbja, vytašča, dostroja, alongside vidja, leža, sidja, uča, but also videv, plyvše, plakavsja alongside sobravše, vozstavše, vzjav, sedše.
26. Op. cit., p. 6.

A NOTE ON A TYPE OF HENDIADYS IN TECHNICAL RUSSIAN

By R. H. Stacy

Syracuse University

The term hendiadys—it means “one through two” in Greek—has long been used by grammarians and classical scholars and is defined in The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature as “A figure of speech by which a single complex idea is expressed by two words connected by a conjunction.” This word seems particularly appropriate for describing a phenomenon which I have noticed time and time again in translating technical and semi-technical Russian into English. Let me give a few examples.

In one article there was reference to nasosy i pompy, i. e., “pumps” in general. In another article I came across rezervy i zapasy, i. e., “reserves” in general. In still another article I found the phrase vidy i formy, i. e., simply “forms.” In a fourth article I noticed ljufty i zazory, which again very clearly meant “instances of play” in general. It will be seen that in each of these four examples the hendiadys is made up of one word of Slavic origin (nasosy, zapasy, vidy, zazory) and one word of non-Slavic origin (pompy, rezervy, formy, ljufty). A good number of other examples could be cited—all exhibiting exactly the same type of pairing.

A similar situation is found in the phrase dvuxmotornyj samolet s dvumja dvigateljami, i. e., “a twin-motor aircraft with two engines.” Again we have a Slavic phrase (s dvumja dvigateljami) accompanied by a non-Slavic “epexegetical” word (dvuxmotornyj).

Are these merely examples of poor writing or are they a kind of “technical tautology”?¹ Are they a stylistic peculiarity similar to the pairs, both alliterative and non-alliterative, so often encountered in English and German?² Or do they perhaps represent a condensed formula illustrating the co-existence of native and foreign elements in literary Russian?

Notes

1. It would seem that technical writing should, of all writing, be free of redundancies. But we have, after all, the so-called "legal tautologies" (e.g., "to have and to hold") in the Law, and the Law has been defined as "common sense raised to the nth degree."

2. "Thick and thin," "rich and poor," "über Stock und Stein," etc.

LIST OF SOVIET PERIODICALS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
AND HUMANITIES INITIALLY ACCESSIONED BY THE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS DURING 1959

By Norman Henley

Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College

Wherever possible, the periodicals listed below were consulted in person, but the compilation is mainly a reorganization and quotation (with a few changes) of materials found in the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions. The categories are arranged alphabetically. The issue numbers given are usually those mentioned earliest in the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions, but whenever it has been determined that earlier published issues have also been accessioned, the latter have been cited.

Agriculture (General)

Agrikultura ši viteritul Moldovei (Agriculture and Animal Husbandry of Moldavia). Vol. 3, No. 4, April 1958. In Moldavian.

Azərbaycan sosialist kənd təsərrüfatı (Socialist Agriculture of Azerbaijan). Vol. 7, No. 2, Feb. 1958. In Azerbaijani.

Sel'skoe xozjajstvo Severo-Zapadnoj zony (Agriculture of the Northwestern Zone). Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan. 1959.

Sel'skoe xozjajstvo Turkmenistana (Agriculture of Turkmenistan). Vol. 3, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1959.

Xoçagii kişloki Toçikiston (Agriculture of Tajikistan). Vol. 9, No. 5, May 1955. In Tajik.

Zemledelie i životnovodstvo Moldavii (Agriculture and Animal Husbandry of Moldavia). Vol. 14, No. 1, Jan. 1959.

Anthropology

Sovetskaja antropologija (Soviet Anthropology). Vol. 1, No. 1, 1957. For some time Soviet anthropologists have not had a periodical completely to themselves and have been forced to publish their articles in ethnological journals. This new vehicle should be a welcome stimulus for Soviet anthropology.

Architecture and Construction (General)

Praktika restavracionnyx rabot (Methods of Restoration). Issued by the Institute of the Theory and History of Architecture and Construction Engineering (Institut teorii i istorii arxitektury i stroitel'noj texniki) of the Academy of Construction and Architecture of the U.S.S.R. (Akademija stroitel'stva i arxitektury SSSR). No. 2, 1958.

Referativnyj sbornik literatury po stroitel'stvu i arxitekture (Journal of Abstracts of Literature on Construction and Architecture). Issued by the Academy of Construction and Architecture of the U.S.S.R. (Akademija stroitel'stva i arxitektury SSSR). No. 1, 1958.

Sbornik naučnyx rabot (Collected Papers) of the Institute of Construction and Architecture (Instytut budaŭnictva i arxitektury) of the Academy of Sciences of the White Russian S.S.R. (Akademija navuk BSSR). No. 1, 1958.

Stroitel'stvo i arxitektura za rubežom (Construction and Architecture Abroad). No. 3, 1956.

Vestnik (Journal) of the Academy of Construction and Architecture of the Ukrainian S.S.R. (Akademija budivnytva i arxitektury URSR). No. 1, 1958. Apparently continued in Ukrainian. See next title.

Visnyk (Journal) of the Academy of Construction and Architecture of the Ukrainian S.S.R. No. 2, 1958. In Ukrainian. Apparently a continuation of the preceding title.

Žiliščnoe stroitel'stvo (Housing Construction). Issued by the State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. for Construction (Gosudarstvennyj komitet Soveta Ministrov SSSR po delam stroitel'stva). No. 4-5, 1958. A monthly containing illustrations and plans.

Bibliography

Bibliotečno-bibliografičeskij bjulleten' (Library and Bibliographical Bulletin) of the Central Library (Central'naja naučnaja biblioteka) of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh S.S.R. No. 1, 1958.

Informacionnyj bjulleten' novyx inostrannyx knig, postupivšix v Biblioteku imeni V. I. Lenina. Serija 3: Obscestvennye nauki, xudožestvennaja literatura (Information Bulletin on New Foreign Books Accessioned by the V. I. Lenin Library. Series 3: Social Sciences and Literature). Issued by the Public Library (Publičnaja biblioteka) of Moscow.

Letopis' žurnal'nyx i gazetnyx statej (List of periodical and newspaper articles). Issued by the Kirghiz State Bibliographic Chamber (Kirgizskaja gosudarstvennaja knižnaja palata). No. 1, Jan.-March, 1956. In Kirghiz and Russian.

Novi knyhy URSS (New books of the Ukrainian S.S.R.). Issued by the Bibliographic Chamber of the Ukrainian S.S.R. (Knyžkova palata URSS). No. 1, Jan. 1959. In Ukrainian. A biweekly. Obviously an important tool for Ukrainian specialists.

Novye knigi za rubežom po obščestvennym naukam: Èkonomika, filosofija, istorija (New Books Abroad on the Social Sciences: Economics, Philosophy, History). Issued by the Publishing House of Foreign Literature (Izdatel'stvo inostrannoju literatury). Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan. 1959. Contains a limited number of book reviews without bibliographical listings.

Spisok knig, imejuščixsja v dubletnom fonde (List of Books in the Duplicate Collection). Issued by the Fundamental Library of Social Sciences (Fundamental'naja biblioteka obščestvennyx nauk) of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. No. 13, 1958.

Vestnik Matenadarana (Matenadaran Review). Issued by the State Archives of Ancient Manuscripts (Gosudarstvennoe xranilišče drevnix rukopisej) of the Armenian S.S.R. No. 4, 1958. In Armenian.

Economics and Commerce

Bjuliten' po obmenu žiloj ploščadi (Bulletin for the Exchange of Living Quarters). No. 7, Nov. 1958. Issued each Sunday by the Moscow City Council of Workers' Deputies. An interesting vehicle for advertising a Muscovite's desire to trade a room for one larger or smaller, one room for an apartment, etc.

Èkonomika Radians'koj Ukrainy (Economics of the Soviet Ukraine). Issued by the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R. No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1959. In Ukrainian.

Èkonomika stroitel'stva (Economics of Construction). Issued by the State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. for Construction (Gosudarstvennyj komitet Soveta Ministrov SSSR po delam stroitel'stva). No. 1, Jan. 1959. A monthly.

Narodnoe xozjajstvo Kazaxstana (National Economy of Kazakhstan). No. 1, Jan. 1959.

Problemy statistiki i učeta (Problems of Statistics and

Accounting). Issued by the Institute of Economics and Statistics (Ekonomiko-statističeskij institut) in Moscow. No. 1, 1958.

Sbornik naučnyx rabot (Collected Studies) of the All-Union Correspondence Institute of Soviet Trade (Vsesojuznyj institut sovetskoj trgovli) in Moscow. No. 2, 1958.

Texniko-èkonomičeskij bjulleten' (Technical and Economic bulletin) of the Kemerovo Economic Administrative Region (Kemerovskij èkonomičeskij administrativnyj rajon). No. 1-2 (9-10), Jan.-Feb. 1959.

Trudy (Studies) of the Department of Economic Research (Otdel èkonomičeskix issledovanij) of the Ural Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. No. 1, 1958.

Trudy (Studies) of the Institute of Economics (Instytut èkonomiki) of the Academy of Sciences of the White Russian S.S.R. (Akademija navuk PSSR). No. 1, 1958.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the Department of the Geography and Economics of the East (Kafedra geografii i èkonomiki stran Vostoka) of the Institute of International Relations (Institut meždunarodnyx otnošenij) in Moscow. No. 2, 1958.

Education (General)

Azërbaïčan mektëbi (Azerbaijan Schools). No. 2 (125), Feb. 1958. In Azerbaijani.

Maktabi soveti (Soviet School). Vol. 33, No. 1 (321), June 1958. In Tajik.

Mugalimderge žardam (Magazine for Teachers). Vol. 30, No. 1, Jan. 1958. In Kirghiz.

Mugallyma kòmek (Magazine for Teachers). No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1958. In Turkmen.

Fine Arts

Xudožnik (Artist). Issued by the Association of Artists of the R.S.F.S.R. (Sojuz xudožnikov RSFSR). No. 2, 1958. A deluxe monthly, profusely illustrated, partly in color.

Geography

Geografičnyj zbirnyk (Geographic Review). Issued by the Geographic Society of the Ukrainian S.S.R. No. 1, 1956. In Ukrainian.

Geografija i xozjajstvo (Geography and Economics). No. 1, 1958.

Informacionnyj bjulleten' (Information Bulletin) of the Soviet Antarctic Expedition, 1955-58 (Sovetskaja antarktičeskaja èkspedicija, 1955-58). No. 3, 1958.

Informacionnyj sbornik o rabotax po Meždunarodnomu geofizičeskomu godu (Information on Studies Prepared in Connection with the International Geophysical Year). Issued by the Geography Faculty of Moscow University. No. 1, 1958.

Inostrannaja literatura ob Antarktike (Foreign Publications on the Antarctic). No. 6, 1958.

Izvestija (Bulletin) of the Novosibirsk Branch (Novosibirskij otdel) of the Geographic Society of the U.S.S.R. (Geografičeskoe obščestvo SSSR). No. 1, 1957.

Izvestija (Bulletin) of the Omsk Branch (Omskij otdel) of the Geographic Society of the U.S.S.R. No. 2 (9), 1957.

Problemy Arktiki (Problems of the Arctic). No. 2, 1957.

Problemy Severa (Problems of the North). No. 1, 1958.

Raboty (Studies) of the Tien Shan Physical Geography Station (Tian'-Šanskaja fiziko-geografičeskaja stancija) of the Academy of Sciences of the Kirghiz S.S.R. No. 1, 1958.

Trudy (Studies) of the Department of Geography and the Tien Shan Physical Geography Station (Otdel geografii i Tian'-Šanskoj fiziko-geografičeskoi stancii). Issued by the Department of Geography of the Academy of Sciences of the Kirghiz S.S.R. No. 1, 1958.

Trudy (Studies) of the Geography Faculty of Minsk University. No. 1, 1958.

Trudy (Studies) of the Geographic Society of the Georgian S.S.R. (Geografičeskoe obščestvo Gruzinskoj SSR). No. 3, 1958. In Georgian with summaries in Russian.

Turistkie tropy: Al'manax (Tourist trails: Miscellany). Vol. 1, 1958.

Vodnoènergetičeskie resursy kol'skogo poluostrova (Water Power Resources of the Kola Peninsula). Issued by the Kola Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. No. 1, 1958.

History

Istoriko-filologičeskij žurnal (Historical and Philological Journal). Issued by the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian S.S.R. No. 3, 1958. In Armenian with summaries in Russian.

Izvestija: Serija istorii, arxeologii i ètnografii (Bulletin: Series in History, Archeology, and Ethnography). Issued by the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh S. S. R. No. 1(6), 1958.

Pis'mennye istočniki v sobranii Gosudarstvennogo istoričeskogo muzeja (Manuscript Sources in the Collection of the State Historical Museum). Issued by the State Historical Museum in Moscow. Part 1, 1958.

Slavjanskij arxiv (Slavic Archives). Vol. 1, 1958.

Sovetskoe kitaevedenie (Soviet Sinology). Issued by the Institute of Sinology of the Academy of Sciences of the U. S. S. R. No. 1, 1958. This was published on a quarterly basis in 1958 and is one of the indications of the importance Russia attaches to Sinology.

Učēnye zapiski (Studies). Issued by the Department of the History of the East (Kafedra istorii stran Vostoka) of the Institute of International Relations (Institut meždunarodnyx otnoženij) in Moscow. No. 1, 1958.

Labor

Bjulleten' naučnoj informacii: Trud i zarabotnaja plata (Bulletin of Research Information: Labor and Wages). No. 1, 1959. A monthly on the labor and wages of the Soviet Union but with much space devoted to both communist and capitalist countries abroad.

Oxrana truda i social'noe straxovanie (Labor Hygiene and Social Insurance). No. 1, July 1958. A monthly issued by the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. The emphasis is primarily on industrial safety with some attention to such matters as disability evaluation, sick leave, maternity privileges, sanatoriums, rest homes, etc.

Trudy (Studies) of the Research Institute of Mine Safety (Naučno-issledovatel'skij institut po bezopasnosti rabot v gornej promyšlennosti) in Makeyevka. Vol. 9, No. 2, 1959.

Voprosy truda (Labor Questions). Issued by the Labor Research Institute (Naučno-issledovatel'skij institut truda) in Moscow. No. 1, 1958.

Language

Filologičeskij sbornik (Philological Collection) of the Student Research Society (Studenčeskoe naučnoe obščestvo) of Leningrad University. No. 1, 1957.

Materialy po mašinnomu perevodu (Materials on Machine Translation). Issued by Leningrad University. No. 1, 1958. This issue includes articles on the general problem and on the machine translation into Russian of Indonesian, Norwegian, Arabic, Burmese, Hindi, and Japanese.

Russkij jazyk v armjanskoj škole (Russian Language in Armenian Schools). No. 4, 1958.

Slavjanskaja filologija (Slavic Philology). Issued by the Soviet Committee of Slavists of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. No. 1, 1958. A collection of articles by scholars of several countries dedicated to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists. In Russian, French, Polish, etc.

Slov'jans'ke movoznavstvo (Slavic Linguistics). No. 1, 1958. In Ukrainian.

Trudy (Studies) of the Department of Old Georgian (Kafedra drevnegruzinskogo jazyka) of Tiflis University. No. 3, 1956.

Učēnye zapiski (Studies) of the Eastern Faculty (Vostočnyj fakul'tet) of the Institute of International Relations (Institut meždunarodnix otnošenij) in Moscow. No. 1, 1958.

Učēnye zapiski (Studies) of the Western Faculty (Zapadnyj fakul'tet) of the Institute of International Relations in Moscow. No. 1, 1958.

Ukrains'ka mova v školi (Ukrainian Language in Schools). Vol. 9, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1959. In Ukrainian. Similar to Russkij jazyk v škole.

Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти масалалари (Problems of the Uzbek language and literature). Vol. 1, No. 2, April 1958. In Uzbek.

Law

Pytannja deržavy i prava Ukrains'koj RSR (Problems of State and Law of the Ukrainian S.S.R.). Vol. 7, 1958. In Ukrainian.

Radjans'ke pravo (Soviet Law). No. 3, May-June 1958. In Ukrainian.

Sovetskaja kriminalistika na službe sledstvija (Soviet Criminology in the Service of Investigation). No. 9, 1957.

Librarianship

Sborinik materialov po soxrannosti knižnyx fondov (Collected Papers on the Preservation of Book Collections). Issued by the

Department of the Care and Restoration of Books (Otdel gigieny i restavracii knig) of the Moscow Public Library. No. 2, 1953.

Literature

Al'manax (Miscellany) of the Poltava Branch (Poltavs'ka filija) of the Association of Writers of the Ukraine (Spilka pys'mennykiv Ukrainy). No. 1, 1957. In Ukrainian.

Ašxabad: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj i obščestvenno-političeskij al'manax (Ashkhabad: Literary and Sociopolitical Miscellany). Issued by the Association of Writers of Turkmenistan (Sojuz pisatelej Turkmenistana). Vol. 1, No. 1-2, 1957.

Donbass: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj i obščestvenno-političeskij al'manax (Donets Basin: Literary and Sociopolitical Miscellany). Issued by the Donets Branch of the Association of Writers of the Ukraine. No. 2(36), 1956.

Družba: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj al'manax (Friendship: Literary Miscellany). Issued by the Association of Writers of the Mari A.S.S.R. Vol. 11, 1957.

Erevan: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj al'manax (Erivan: Literary Miscellany). Issued by the Association of Writers of Armenia. Vol. 1, No. 1, 1957.

Južnyj Ural: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj al'manax (Southern Urals: Literary Miscellany). Vol. 21, No. 2-3(28-29), 1957.

Kostroma: Literaturnyj sbornik (Kostroma: Literary Collection). No. 9, 1957.

Literatura v školi (Literature in the School). Vol. 9, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1959. In Ukrainian. Similar to Literatura v škole but with a natural emphasis on Ukrainian literature.

Literaturnaja Kaluga (Literary Kaluga). Issued by the Kaluga Literary Association. No. 3, 1956.

Literaturnaja Mordovija: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj al'manax (Literary Mordovia: Literary Miscellany). No. 15(19), 1958.

Literaturnaja Tula: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj i obščestvenno-političeskij al'manax (Literary Tula: Literary and Sociopolitical Miscellany). Vol. 13, 1957.

Literaturnyj Smolensk: Al'manax (Literary Smolensk: Miscellany). No. 16, 1957.

Mokša. No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1957. In Mordvinian. A literary and sociopolitical miscellany.

Novaja Volga: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj i obščestvenno-političeskij al'manax (New Volga: Literary and Sociopolitical Miscellany). Vol. 26, 1957.

Novgorod: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj sbornik (Novgorod: Literary Collection). No. 7, 1958.

Prapor: Literaturno-xudožnij ta hromads'ko-polityčnyj žurnal (Banner: Literary and Sociopolitical Magazine). No. 1, Jan. 1959. In Ukrainian.

Priamur'e: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj al'manax (Amur Region: Literary Miscellany). No. 1, 1951.

Sever: Literaturno-xudožestvennyj al'manax (The North: Literary Miscellany). No. 18, 1957.

Sovet ědebiaty (Soviet Literature). Issued by the Association of Writers of the Turkmen S.S.R. No. 1, 1958. In Turkmen.

Trudy (Studies) of the Department of Modern Russian Literature (Otdel novoj russkoj literatury) of the Institute of Russian Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. Vol. 1, 1957. This is apparently intended to be an annual, a companion work to the well-established Trudy of the Department of Old Russian Literature of the same Institute. The first volume has four articles on Saltykov-Ščedrin.

Vsesvit (The World). No. 1, July 1958. In Ukrainian.

Medicine (General)

Peziria senetecii (Health Service). Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1959. In Moldavian.

Trudy (Studies) of the State Medical Institute (Gosudarstvennyj medicinskij institut) in Novosibirsk. Vol. 27, 1957.

Zdravooxranenie (Public Health). Issued by the Ministry of Health of the Moldavian S.S.R. (Ministerstvo zdravooxranenija Moldavskoj SSR). Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1959.

Zdravooxranenie Belorussii (Public Health of White Russia). Vol. 5, No. 1, Jan. 1959.

Zdravooxranenie Turkmenistana (Public Health in Turkmenistan). Vol. 3, No. 1(13), Jan.-Feb. 1959.

Motion Pictures

Katalog sovetskix xudožestvennyx fil'mov (Catalog of Soviet Dramatic Films). No. 1, 1957.

Sovetskij fil'm (Soviet Films). Issued by the All-Union Motion Picture Association (Vsesojuznoe kinoob''edinenie). No. 6, 1958. An attractive monthly containing information about the latest Soviet productions. Probably more illustration than text.

Music

Naukovi zapysky (Studies) of the State Conservatory (Deržavna konservatorija) in Lvov. No. 1, 1957. In Ukrainian.

Voprosy muzykal'no-ispolnitel'skogo iskusstva (The Art of Musical Performance). No. 2, 1958.

Philosophy

Trudy (Studies) of the Institute of Psychology of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian S.S.R. Vol. 11, 1957. In Georgian with summaries in Russian.

Voprosy èstetiki (Esthetics). No. 1, 1958.

Physical Education and Sports

Problemy junošeskogo sporta (Problems of Sport for Youth). Issued by the Central Research Institute of Physical Education (Central'nyj naučno-issledovatel'skij institut fizičeskoj kul'tury). No. 1, 1958.

Political Science

Azerbajčan kommunisti (Azerbaijan Communist). No. 1, Jan. 1959. In Azerbaijani.

Bjulleten' (Bulletin). Issued by the Executive Committee (Ispolnitel'nyj komitet) of Moscow. No. 2(392), Jan. 1958.

Kommunist Moldavii (Communist of Moldavia). Issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia. Vol. 4, No. 1, Jan. 1959.

Kommunistul Moldovei (Communist of Moldavia). Issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia. Vol. 4, No. 3, March 1959.

Trudy (Studies) of the Institute of the History of the Party under the Jurisdiction of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan. Vol. 20, 1957.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the Institute of International Relations (Institut meždunarodnyx otnošenij) in Moscow. No. 1, 1958.

Popular Magazines

Kapkān: Čuvaškij satiričeskij žurnal (Trap: Chuvash Satirical Magazine). No. 6(327), March 1959. In Chuvash.

Muštum (Punch). Vol. 37, No. 8(554), April 1959. In Uzbek.

Tadžikistan (Tajikistan). Issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan. Vol. 4, No. 1, Jan. 1959.

Printing and the Book Trade

Informacionnye materialy (Informative Materials). Issued by the All-Union Research Institute of the Printing Industry and Technology (Vsesojuznyj naučno-issledovatel'skij institut poligrafičeskij promyšlennosti i texniki) in Moscow. No. 16, 1958.

Voprosy redaktirovanija: Sbornik studenčeskix naučnyx rabot (Editing: Student Research Papers). Issued by the Department of Editing of the Moscow Correspondence Institute of Printing. No. 2, 1958.

Scholarly Journals

Izvestija: Serija èkonomiki, filosofii i prava (Bulletin: Series in Economics, Philosophy, and Law). Issued by the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh S. S. R.

Naučnye trudy (Studies) of the Institute of Soviet Trade (Institut sovetsoj torgovli) in Samarkand. Vol. 8, 1957.

Naukovi zapysky (Studies) of the Research Institute of Pedagogy (Naukovo-doslidnyj instytut pedagogiki) in Kiev. Vol. 6, 1957. In Ukrainian.

Praci: Zbirnyk molodyx učenyx universytetu (Studies: Papers by Young Scholars of the University). Issued by Odessa University. Vol. 148, No. 2, 1958. In Ukrainian.

Praci naukovyx robitnykiv L'vivs'koho deržavnoho universytetu im. Ivana Franka i bibliografičnyj pokazčyk (Studies by Researchers of the Ivan Franko Lvov State University and Bibliographical Index). Issued by the Library (Naukova biblioteka) of Lvov University. No. 1, 1957.

Učēnye zapiski (Studies) of the Adygei Research Institute of Language, Literature, and History (Adygejskij naučno-issledovatel'skij institut jazyka, literatury i istorii). Vol. 1, 1957.

Učēnye zapiski (Studies). Issued by the Buryat-Mongolian

State Pedagogical Institute (Burjat-Mongol'skij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut). No. 11, 1957.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the Leninabad State Pedagogical Institute (Leninabadskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut). No. 5, 1957.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the State Pedagogical Institute (Gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut) in Chardzhou. No. 2, 1957.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the State Pedagogical Institute (Gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut) in Kazan. No. 12, 1957.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the State Pedagogical Institute (Gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut) in Kursk. No. 4, 1957.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the State Pedagogical Institute (Gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut) in Yaroslavl. No. 23 (33), 1957.

Učënye zapiski (Studies) of the State Correspondence Pedagogical Institute (Gosudarstvennyj zaočnyj pedagogičeskij institut) in Moscow. Vol. 1, 1958.

Zbirnyk students'kyx naukovnyx robıt (Collection of Student Research Papers). Issued by the Student Research Society (Students'ke naukovne tovarystvo) of Lvov University. No. 1, 1957.

Sociology

Azerbajčan gadyny (Azerbaijan Woman). Issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan. No. 5, May 1954. In Azerbaijan.

Klubnyj kalendar' (Community Center Calendar). No. 1, Jan.-June 1959.

Komsomol'skaja zizn' (Communist Youth League Life). Issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Youth League. No. 1, Jan. 1959. A small biweekly bulletin.

Kyrgyzstan aialdary (Kirghiz Woman). Vol. 8, No. 1(51), Jan. 1958. In Kirghiz.

Sovet Turkmenistanynyn aiallary (Soviet Turkmen Woman). No. 1(52), Jan. 1958. In Turkmen.

Theater

Teatral'naja žizn' (Life of the Theater). No. 1, July 1958.

A biweekly magazine of the popular type, well illustrated. Devoted to the theatrical life, especially drama, of the Russian Federation.

Teatral'nyj Leningrad (Theatrical Leningrad). No. 8 (544), Feb. 1959. Weekly bulletin listing the current theatrical offerings in Leningrad.

REVIEWS

Avrahm Yarmolinsky. Literature Under Communism: The Literary Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin. (Indiana Univ. Russian and East European Series, 20.) [n.p., n.d.]. vii, 165 pp., \$4.00.

George Gibian. Interval of Freedom: Soviet Literature During the Thaw, 1954-1957. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press [c. 1960]. xii, 180, \$4.25.

These two books about Soviet literature, published almost simultaneously, are mutually complementary and should be read one after the other. Mr. Yarmolinsky recapitulates, with a considerable wealth of detail and in a scrupulously objective and matter-of-fact manner, the account of Soviet literary policies and their impact upon literature during the so-called "Ždanov era," which began in 1946 and ended soon after Stalin's death, and which he rightly describes as "a nightmarish page in the history of letters" and "one of the more dangerous phases of the totalitarian madness." Professor Gibian takes up the story in 1953—he sees the first swallow of the Spring of Freedom in Olga Berggol'ts's article, published six weeks after Stalin's death—and carries it through 1957, characterizing this four-year period as an "interval of freedom."

The bulk of Mr. Yarmolinsky's account consists of a factual exposé with numerous quotations from Soviet sources and a minimum of comment, and this enhances its effectiveness: the facts and the quotations speak eloquently enough for themselves. Much of the story would make a ludicrous, even farcical, reading if it were not so sad—nay, tragic. And the most tragic feature of all is not the terrible repressive machinery of the totalitarian Communist state, but the readiness with which Soviet writers, critics, and literary scholars yielded to its pressure, the abject servility which they displayed on so many occasions. To quote Mr. Yarmolinsky:

The Party pronouncements reverberated throughout the Soviet intellectual world. Promises to follow the directives implicit in them came from groups of scholars, educators, scientists. In an address to Stalin the faculties of the Moscow institutions of higher learning declared that the Rulings and Zhdanov's speech had "historic significance for the whole ideological front and are programmatic documents for the entire vast army of the Soviet intelligenzia." Individual

commentators contributed to the orgy of sycophancy: the Party's dicta "have given the writers wings"; their significance is not confined to the Soviet Union, for "they set the problems of the moral purification of mankind from the miasma of fascism, obscurantism, cynicism"; they are "a word to which everyone working in Soviet literature should give profound thought and wholehearted acceptance." In short, the postanovleniya joined the body of writings possessed of Scriptural inerrancy and authority. So, too, did Zhdanov's ineptly worded outpouring of self-righteous scurrility, puerile bragging and crude theorizing, a performance verging on the obscene. [References to footnotes have been omitted from this quotation. —G. S.]

Scrupulously providing chapter and verse (in one case only, on p. 142, is a reference missing), and relying nearly always on Soviet sources, Mr. Yarmolinsky illustrates various aspects of the Zdanov era as reflected in literature. One of the most interesting chapters is Chapter XI, entitled "Bogus Criticism and Dissembling Doctrine," in which the controversy around so-called "conflictlessness" in Soviet dramaturgy, which arose towards the end of the period under discussion, is analyzed and shown conclusively to have been one of the many typical examples of Soviet double-talk.

Some interesting considerations are also to be found in Chapter XII ("A Trojan Horse?"), dealing with the appropriation by the rulers and pundits of Communist Russia of the classical heritage of Russian literature which, in the main, is so flagrantly at variance with the principles and practices of totalitarian Communism. Since the works of that literature "speak clearly, if indirectly, for freedom, candor, compassion, for an ethos that holds the individual inviolate," the ultimate motives of the authorities in giving their official approval and encouragement to the preservation of the literary heritage seem to Mr. Yarmolinsky somewhat puzzling. On the other hand, he feels reasonably certain that pre-revolutionary literature acts as an antidote to Soviet propaganda. Perhaps, he says, "it is not mere wishful thinking to suppose that the propagation of humane letters has placed in the citadel of Communism a Trojan horse."

Comic relief is provided for the reader by a detailed exposé of the two enormously long novels by Nikolaj Španov—Podžigateli (The Incendiaries) and Zagovorščiki (The Plotters)—written in response to Party demands and giving a fantastically absurd picture of the origins of World War II. The Epilogue to the former novel is laid in 1947 or 1948. One of the characters, Foster Dulles, has become a senator and receives an assignment to take over the Vatican, "so as to substitute loyalty to a universal Church for loyalty to the national state." At the end of the Epilogue he is shown wearing the cassock of a Capuchin friar and talking to an American Jesuit, formerly a gangster: "From this conversation the reader gathers that Dulles had in the past barely escaped prison for forging a check, and that he now expects to be elected cardinal." "Is this a gigantic hoax, spoofing the anti-American mania?" asks Mr. Yarmolinsky, and answers: "By no means. The author is in dead earnest. The book bears the imprint of the Central Committee of the Young Communist

League, and the flyleaf has it that 75,000 copies of the second edition were printed." In one review the novel was hailed as "a true-to-life picture of the most important events forming the background of the last war."

There is an inaccuracy in the statement about Axmatova on p. 22; some confusion about footnotes in Chapter X, and quite a number of misprints, but none of them really bad.

The reader of Mr. Yarmolinsky's dismal story will approach Professor Gibian's book with some caution: Given the conditions, described in the former, under which literature had to function, and given especially the readiness, if not the eagerness, with which the literary profession toed the Party line, could there be any question of real freedom so long as the Party tutelage continued? Certainly some of the things said or written during the four years of the so-called "Thaw" were in sharp contrast with the state of things in the seven years preceding Stalin's death. But to me Professor Gibian's picture of the post-Stalin period seems at times to be tinged with excessive optimism or wishful thinking.

The book is thematically, rather than chronologically, organized. The main developments in the post-Stalin period are described, by way of an introduction, in a short chapter entitled "Freedom and Aftermath, 1953 to 1958." Then follow three longer chapters in which the literary output of those years is examined from the thematic point of view and therefore with inevitable overlapping. The headings of the first two of those chapters speak for themselves: "The Scientist as Hero, Saint, and Martyr," and "Love Versus Steel Production." The third chapter, entitled "Versions of a Soviet Inferno," discusses the different kinds of "villains" in recent Soviet novels, stories, and plays, from Leonov's The Russian Forest to the stories of Granin, Zdanov, and Jašin, published in the second volume of Literaturnaja Moskva. In his "Author's Preface" Professor Gibian explains his choice of the subjects for the three main chapters by saying that they are the most important and frequent themes of recent Soviet literature and that they offer an excellent approach to the thinking of Soviet writers. He also explains as follows his selection of works discussed in each of those chapters: "The procedure is usually to start with a work typical of the 'conservative,' or Stalinist, Party-line literature, and then to move from one non-Stalinist book or group of books to another, usually progressively more and more vehemently anti-Stalinist, critical, even iconoclastic." He adds that if "negative" or "critical" works are disproportionately highly represented in his study, it is because they are the best and most interesting works of the period, and also because the Party-line works are all very much alike and therefore it is not necessary usually to examine more than one of them, while the "negative" books "are to some extent free expressions of individuals."

In the course of his examination Professor Gibian discusses at some length such works as Erenburg's The Thaw, Dudincev's Not By Bread Alone, Kaverin's Quests and Hopes, Galina Nikolaeva's A Battle on the Way, Kornejčuk's The Wings, Pogodin's Petrarch's Sonnet, Kirsanov's poem "Seven Days of the Week," stories by Granin, Zdanov, Jašin, and Gorbunov,

and many others. On all of them he has many interesting and pertinent things to say, often drawing parallels with the nineteenth-century Russian literature, or—for the benefit of his American readers—with the treatment of similar themes by contemporary American writers (for example, in the chapter on science in literature). He is under no illusion about the purely literary value of most of the works he discusses. In his preface he reminds the reader that Soviet literature to this day is unaffected by such men as Proust, Joyce, Kafka, T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, and Freud, or by the Russian non-realistic literary heritage; and later, in summing up his conclusions, repeats again that “in 1958 as in 1952, it was still true that Joyce, Proust, Kafka, and Freud might as well have never existed for all the influence they exerted on Soviet writing,” and that the innovations made by some authors during the “interval of freedom” were “limited to themes and attitudes toward their subjects,” while little attempt was made “to escape the confines of socialist realism in style or manner.” Yet at times he seems to be carried away by this “novelty” of attitude and tends to overrate this or that work from the literary point of view. This is particularly so in the case of Galina Nikolaeva’s Bitva v puti, a work, in his opinion, of extraordinary complexity, variety, and power, and “one of the most successful artistic achievements of any Soviet novelist in recent time.” From the “ideological” point of view, he also sees in it, I think, much more than it actually offers (see pp. 91-100). He is guilty also of exaggerating the ideological significance—and by implication, to some extent, the literary value—of some other works, including Dudincev’s well-known novel and Pogodin’s play Petrarch’s Sonnet. There are some other specific points on which the present reviewer feels like disagreeing with Professor Gibian: for instance, his estimate of Xruščev’s speech at the Writers’ Congress in 1959, which he describes as “a pleasurable, unique experience,” and especially his conclusion that this “whimsical talk, spiced with indiscretions and hints of indiscretions, seemed to promise other, better things to come.” While it is true that in tone and manner Xruščev’s speech offered a contrast to those of Stalin or Ždanov, behind it one felt no less, if not more, contempt for the writers.

It is a pity that in discussing at length the figure of Gracianskij, the “villain” in Leonov’s novel The Russian Forest, whom he regards as “a survival of pre-revolutionary ways of thinking and an alien, inimical element in Soviet life,” Professor Gibian does not mention the opposite view of the young and talented Soviet critic Mark Ščeglov who saw in Gracianskij a product of Soviet conditions and was sharply attacked for this heresy at the beginning of the “Thaw.”

A separate chapter is devoted in the book to Pasternak, his novel and the circumstances which accompanied its publication. While he has some reservations about Doctor Živago as a novel, Professor Gibian has no hesitation in saying that it is artistically superior to any of the other books discussed by him (“perhaps superior to any book written in Russia in the last quarter of a century,” he adds) and that it “surpasses all of them as a human and cultural document.” At the same time it is for him the climax of the critical, iconoclastic trend in the

post-Stalin literature: "Pasternak carries to the extreme some of the themes which other Soviet authors have treated more moderately or gingerly."

In the last chapter, "The Interval in Perspective," we find some summing-up. A note of caution is sounded here, lest some too far-reaching conclusions be drawn from his account of the "Thaw." The degree of freedom actually granted to the writers must not be exaggerated, says Professor Gibian, but neither must the implications of the "critical" literature of those years be minimized. Soviet writers, in his opinion, have gone beyond Khrushchev in the rejection of Stalinism: Khrushchev tended to isolate Stalinism as a phenomenon unrelated to other aspects of Soviet life and kept silent on two important points implicit in his indictment of Stalin: "how it was possible for Stalinism to develop in Soviet society (is there anything in the society which permitted, perhaps even encouraged, the emergence of Stalinism?) and whether it did not have consequences beyond itself (did it not taint other areas of Soviet life?). Soviet writers . . . have answered both questions, at least by implication. Their books show mechanisms in Soviet society which favor lesser men of Stalin's kind."

So much for the "negative" significance of various non-Stalinist works. On the positive side, they represent for Professor Gibian "a resurgence of humanism." This humanism is "the core from which emanate all their [Soviet writers'] criticisms of Soviet conditions of life and the demands for improvements which they make implicitly or explicitly. . . . The Soviet writers are asking for dignity and individual rights and at times for what we should call civil liberties. Their demands really constitute a proposal for a Soviet version of a Bill of Rights." Professor Gibian sees a link here both with the Russian nineteenth-century tradition and with the Western humanistic ideals and finds it encouraging that after forty years of Soviet rule these links have been preserved. All this is very well, although the words "Soviet version" in the reference to the Bill of Rights have a rather ominous sound. And, fresh from the reading of Mr. Yarmolinsky's book, one cannot help recalling that during the Zdanov era Soviet writers—often the very same writers who were to show later a "critical" attitude: witness Simonov's approval of the revised version of Fadeev's The Young Guard, or Erenburg's contribution to the attack on the "decadent West" in The Ninth Wave—vied with each other in servility. It would be salutary therefore to remember that, as Mr. Yarmolinsky observes in referring to some examples of "self-criticism" towards the end of the Zdanov era: "Public acknowledgement of the Party's responsibility for the impoverishment, the emasculation of literature, was out of the question. The writers were at fault, also the critics, the Writers' Union, the Art Committee, not the Party." This is equally true of the "interval of freedom," except that an additional scapegoat was found in the "cult of the individual": the Party remained blameless, and its hold on literature as firm and as unquestioned as before.

A few minor factual inaccuracies in Professor Gibian's book should be noted. On p. 10 his readers might get the wrong impression that the rehabilitation of literary "unpersons" had

become a common practice as early as 1954: actually most of the rehabilitations came only after Xruščev's dethroning of Stalin in 1956. On the other hand, it is not true that the slowing down of rehabilitations after 1957 affected Axmatova (p. 22). It is somewhat puzzling to read on p. 25 that "the door now seems open for [Pasternak] to apply for readmission to the Union of Writers, which might mean social pardon and financial salvation," and again, on p. 158, that "in the summer of 1959, some moderately conciliatory gestures were made by Soviet officials toward Pasternak." It is not clear what "gestures" Professor Gibian has in mind. On p. 5 there is a strange and unsubstantiated statement about "a spate of effective war novels" produced during World War II: What were those novels? On p. 131 the explanation of the word *škurnik* is not quite correct. And there is at least one bad misprint in the book: on p. 23, last line, for "critics" one should obviously read "cretins."

Gleb Struve
University of California (Berkeley)

Vladimir Mayakovsky. *Klop, Stixi, Poëmy—The Bedbug and Selected Poetry*. Tr. Max Hayward and George Reavey, ed. Patricia Blake. (Meridian Books M94.) New York: Meridian Books, 1960. 317 pp., \$1.55.

The publication of Majakovskij's *The Bedbug and Selected Poetry* is to be greatly welcomed. The book may be divided into three parts: a selection of Majakovskij's verse in Russian with English translations by George Reavey (one by Max Hayward) on the facing page; a translation of his play *The Bedbug* by Max Hayward; and an Introduction by the editor, Patricia Blake.

To begin with the selected poetry, this is not the place to discuss Majakovskij's merits as a poet. If they were not considerable, there would have been no reason for publishing this book. We are concerned here merely with the matter of selection. And on this score there seems little room for complaint. The present selection, less than a hundred pages of Russian, ranges across Majakovskij's entire creative life—from "I" and "The Cloud in Trousers" to "At the Top of My Voice." It does not offer—nor does it claim to—anything that has hitherto been unavailable. What it does offer is a sampling of that part of Majakovskij's vast output which is most likely to appeal to the non-specialist. The emphasis runs roughly counter to that most frequently met with in Soviet anthologies. Stress is laid on the lyrical and the personal; on that portion, in fact, of the poet's work which most surely reveals his personality and his problems and which, consequently, casts some light on his tragic end. The poems selected have both literary merit and human appeal. Their value in this book has been enhanced by the marking of doubtful and unexpected stresses.

The translations are excellent. Occasionally a rendering would send this reviewer scurrying to his dictionary—only to emerge pensive, uncertain, and reluctant to condemn. The answer is that Majakovskij can be ambiguous, even intentionally

ambiguous. Not everyone will applaud every rendering. But it is difficult to deny that the translations are on the whole scrupulously accurate, that they frequently convey the spirit of the original and that they make good reading in English.

Max Hayward's translation of The Bedbug is equally praiseworthy. To keep Majakovskij's brand of humor alive in a foreign language is no mean feat.

In her Introduction Patricia Blake has collected a fair amount of material, old and new, in order to give the reader an account of Majakovskij's life and work. She has, in particular, tackled the thorny problem of his suicide. This problem has, as the Introduction points out, been complicated by crude and conflicting interpretations both from the poet's homeland and abroad. Patricia Blake threads her careful way through the labyrinth of obfuscation and emerges with what to this non-specialist appears to be a balanced and plausible picture. She is convincing in linking the poet's suicide to long-standing personality traits—and to his work. Her materials are interesting and her account has the further merit of being well arranged and well written.

The Bedbug and Selected Poetry has much to offer to the Russian reader, to the English-speaking layman, and to the classroom student of literature.

Walter Vickery
Indiana University

Szczepan K. Zimmer, Stanisław Wyspiański: A Biographical Sketch. Tr. Halina M. Zimmer. Essen (Germany): Leopold Sanicki, 1959. 92 pp.

This biographical sketch commemorates the fiftieth anniversary of the death of the phenomenal poet-painter of Cracow, Stanisław Wyspiański (1869-1907). A readable English translation, it first presents an accurate picture of the lively atmosphere of artistic Cracow towards the end of the nineteenth century and then traces the story of one of its most outstanding sons.

After studies pursued at the Cracow School of Art under the painter Jan Matejko, Wyspiański continued to deepen his knowledge of painting in Paris, where, imbued with the spirit of Impressionism, he underwent some direct influence of Gauguin. Having absorbed Postimpressionism and Expressionism, Wyspiański emerged as an excellent painter of great originality. He soon began to write dramatic poems, followed by plays in verse, starting out with a libretto for an opera. Music and art were forever to remain incorporated into his theatrical conceptions. Unrecognized at first, poor but uncompromising, Wyspiański continued his work in stained glass, children's studies, portraits, landscapes, and illustrations (he was the art editor of the magazine Życie [Life] for a time) and, above all, in the theater. His plays show an increasing concern with matters related to the history and destiny of the Polish nation.

The high point of Zimmer's book is the chapter dealing with Wesele (The Wedding), Wyspiański's dramatic masterpiece and a masterpiece of the Polish stage, which was performed in Cracow in 1901. It became the high point not only in Wyspiański's life, but in the Cracow theater as well. The author gives an adequate and clear analysis of this gem of haunting verse, in which a symbolic vision of the nation's destiny is fused with the realism of an actual country wedding (that of the Cracow poet Lucjan Rydel with a peasant girl of Bronowice). He then discusses more briefly the plays which followed The Wedding and runs through the foreign translations of Wyspiański's works and the important foreign studies about him. The book ends with a chapter about the poet's work as designer of costumes, furniture, and internal architecture.

The effect of the mottoes—quotations from Wyspiański's works—which open the chapters, is lost in English translation. Wyspiański is not translatable. No claim of scholarly attainment is made in this popular though adult, light but relatively well-documented volume, probably aimed at the foreign lay reading public. A specialist, or even an average Polish reader, will find gaps in this sketch. To this reviewer, a native Cracovian, Zimmer's book offers nothing instructive. Several more important and fascinating aspects of Wyspiański's personality and life may be found not only in scholarly studies, but also in works by Wyspiański's famous contemporary friends, such as Boy-Żelenski or St. Przybyszewski, of whom scarcely a mention is made by Zimmer, or even in subsequent reminiscences of the Cracow scene during its end-of-the-century artistic outburst. The curious atmosphere of Wyspiański's production, the mystical power of his verse, all the indispensables of his art, on which, however, it is possible and desirable to ponder, are largely lost to the reader of this volume. Some light shed on Wyspiański's life with his peasant wife and his relation to his children would be justified and welcome in a sketch which its author has called biographical.

A tribute to a genius rather than a profound study, Zimmer's book is very attractively printed on paper of high quality with black and white reproductions of Wyspiański's paintings, drawing, stained glass windows, and interiors.

Olga Scherer-Virski
Paris

Anton Slodnjak. Geschichte der slowenischen Literatur. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1958. 363 pp.

This book by Professor Anton Slodnjak of the University of Ljubljana has been published as a unit of the well-known Grundriss der slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte series, edited by Max Vasmer, and is the only large work in a non-Slavic language yet to be devoted to a history of Slovenian literature.

The book basically consists of an Introduction and two main divisions, called periods. In his (33-page) Introduction Professor Slodnjak first briefly discusses in order developments

in Slovenian literary historical writing, the origins and socio-cultural aspects of the Slovenes, crucial moments in Slovenian history, the development of the Slovenian literary language and tendencies in Slovenian metrics, and then presents a periodization of Slovenian literature. The first period, which occupies only thirteen pages, concerns the oral and written traditions before the time of a Slovenian unity (end of the tenth century to 1550), and the second deals with these traditions during the awakening and consolidation of Slovenian national forces (1550 to the present). The second division, or period, which represents the bulk of the book, is further divided into three principal parts: (1) religious and edificatory literature (1550-1768), (2) national literature and beginnings of secular poetry (1768-1830), and (3) predominance of European literary genres and schools over the various Slovenian forms (1830 to the present).

The most important part of this literary history is the so-called second period, which covers modern Slovenian literature and its beginnings. Professor Slodnjak's periodization utilizes the publication by Primož Trubar of the first two books in Slovenian (1550), the appearance of Anton Pohlin's normative Slovenian grammar (Krajnska grammatika, 1768), and the first issue of the avant-garde almanac Slovenian Bee (Kranjska Čbelica) in 1830 as key literary events. Setting aside the 1550 date as being unassailable, one may wonder why the author did not on the one hand choose general, European divisions for his periodization, e.g., "Reformation," "Counter Reformation," "Baroque," etc., as is done in the Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva (Lino Legiša, ed., vol. I. Ljubljana, 1956), or on the other hand choose the dates of specific writers, e.g., Matija Čop (1797-1835). It is to the author's credit that he did neither, but rather chose Slovenian literary happenings which shaped the creative efforts of future Slovenian writers. Thus, Pohlin's grammar was of tremendous importance for poetry because of the rules on metrics which the book contained, and the Slovenian Bee represented a rallying point of liberal writers against lay and clerical conservatism. However, Professor Slodnjak writes in a masterful and scholarly way on the passage of the great movements of Europe against a Slovenian background and the passage and its effects seem hardly new to any student of Slavic literatures: Reformation (attack, in the vernacular), Counter Reformation (counterattack, in the vernacular), Romanticism (Prešeren's translation of Lenore).

There is disappointingly little in the last section of the second period, headed "Literature as Organ of Social Protest and Struggle (1930-1941)," although the bibliography at the end of the section indicates that a good deal of information is to be had (almost all of it in Slovenian). Despite the heading dates there are works mentioned here which have appeared as late as 1956-1957 (Ciril Kosmač's Ballad of the Trumpet and the Cloud).

The book tends to be a trifle encyclopedic at times, but that is difficult to avoid in a work of this kind. The bibliography at the end of each subsection is most helpful for readers competent in Slovenian. The Personenregister is one of the book's best features: it is complete and highly detailed as to paging.

This is, all things considered, a first-rate, thoughtful book. Professor Slodnjak has done a service to his country and to Slavists and students of literature in general. It is not irrelevant here to note the words of Dmitry Cizevsky in his Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures (Survey of Slavic Civilization, Vol. I [Boston, Massachusetts, 1952], p. 131): "Then there are the cases of the weak impact of poets and other writers, who through the unfavorable conditions of the social and political relations were unable to achieve the effect which should have been theirs, even in their own country, and among their own people. This is true, above all, of those authors among the smaller Slavic peoples whose voices were scarcely audible outside the limits of their own land—not merely in the case of the Lusatian Sorbs, but also of the Slovaks, the Slovenes, etc."

Harold J. Klagstad, Jr.
Indiana University

Morris Halle. The Sound Pattern of Russian: A Linguistic and Acoustical Investigation. With an Excursus on The Contextual Variants of the Russian Vowels by Lawrence G. Jones. (Description and Analysis of Contemporary Standard Russian, I.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1959. 206 pp., Gld. 40.

Halle's work is the first in an ambitious series of monographs which "intends to contribute to an exhaustive description and consistent analysis of contemporary standard Russian . . ." These monographs result from a special program at Harvard directed by Professor Roman Jakobson during the years 1950-58.

Halle assumes that the reader is familiar with Jakobson's phonological theory or at least with its terminology. For one who has not followed contributions in that field it is necessary to read Jakobson and Halle's Fundamentals of Language (1956), not a difficult job in itself (it is a slim volume), though understanding and accepting their theoretical views are rather more difficult. To aid in understanding their premise of binary contrast and their use of acoustical terminology it will be helpful to read two reviews of Fundamentals, one by Chomsky (I. J. A. L., XXXIII [1957]), the other by Joos (Language, XXXIII [1957]), understandably not listed in the bibliography of Halle's present work). For further help I recommend that one go back to Garvin's thoughtful review (Language, XXIX [1953]), of Jakobson, Fant, and Halle's Preliminaries to Speech Analysis (1952), a forerunner of the Fundamentals. Though I do not feel impelled to utter hallelujah to the new metaphysics, I am impressed by the freshness of view and the zeal of the Jakobson group. In the book under review the Foreword and the first chapter (Introduction: A Theory of Phonology) represent a distillation of Halle's work in linguistic theory, buttressed by the dicta of Jakobson and Chomsky. To comment fully (adequately) on Halle's theory and approach would demand an unreasonable amount of space for a review; I shall limit my observations to those which may be of interest to readers of this journal.

The body of the book consists of a detailed description of the phonological system of contemporary Russian and a report on the results of acoustical measurements performed on various linguistic entities. The former illustrates the application of our phonological theory to concrete data, providing thereby an opportunity to judge the theory's effectiveness. The latter establishes the link between the theoretical entities of linguistic descriptions and the real world of sound, of which human speech is undeniably a part. It is this link which raises the theoretical entities of linguistics from the status of convenient fictions to be invented at will to that of terms in a scientific theory. (p. 13.)

Basic to Halle's approach is the acceptance of binary contrasts for describing phonetic properties. Twelve of these pairs of distinctive features were set up and defined in the Fundamentals (pp. 28-32). Since most of us are not yet conditioned to the acoustics-oriented terminology for these two-member categories, Halle often helps us by a translation into the traditional terminology, e.g. Sharped vs. Plain (Palatalized vs. Unpalatalized).

Startling indeed is Halle's choice of speakers for the acoustical analysis of Russian sounds: three of the four speakers were, at the time of publication, over 60 years old, while the fourth was about 49 (the inexactitude is deferential). Moreover, the three older speakers had left Moscow (presumably leaving the country) in the early 1920's, while the younger man had left in the early 1940's. I cannot prove that their sounds are not acoustically representative of contemporary standard Russian, but, having recently been startled by the phonetic changes in the speech of my two brothers (we now live in three different states), I would assume a greater possibility of changes in the speech of speakers removed for many years from their native Moscow; even a glacial conservatism in their respective sound systems would now represent significant change.

Chapter III and IV are not specifically concerned with Russian but are attempts to acquaint the reader with "elementary concepts and techniques of acoustics" and to survey for him the history of acoustical investigations. I found these summaries most rewarding, and I think that they merit separate publication for a larger audience.

Following Halle's contributions (Foreword and first five chapters) is a short paper on "Contextual Variants of the Russian Vowels" by Lawrence G. Jones. Appendix I contains tables of "Formant Frequencies of Russian Vowels," while Appendix II shows "Energy Density Spectra of Stop Bursts and Continuant Consonants."

In general, Halle's work is a closely reasoned, elaborately worked out description of Russian sounds couched in a novel terminology. Within his premises the particulars of the description may be accepted, but the whole scheme seems unnecessarily ponderous. I would hope that the author might some day turn his obvious talents to a description of the Russian sound system which did not involve so much faith in an over-all theory and which could be programmed for the human machine.

Thomas F. Magner
Pennsylvania State University

André von Gronicka and Helen Bates-Yakobson. Essentials of Russian: Pronunciation, Conversation and Comprehension. 12-inch long-playing record and manual. New York: Dover Publications [c. 1959]. \$4.95 (the set).

The manual in this set supplies an exact written reproduction of the material presented orally on the record. The Introduction to the manual declares that "this record has been planned to provide the student, beginning or advanced, with examples of Russian in a variety of forms as spoken by native speakers." Beginning with simple Russian, the selections increase steadily in difficulty. After a very brief phonetic introduction, the authors proceed to present material from their Essentials of Russian (third edition, Prentice-Hall, 1958). The last part of the set is devoted to proverbs and poems by Lermontov, Fet, Puškin, Majkov, and Blok. The material has been recorded by three native speakers—two men and a woman. On side one most selections are read first with pauses for repetition and then repeated with no pauses. On side two no pauses are provided.

This record has been well prepared. In general, the intonation, stress, and timing of the speakers are good. They succeed in achieving the goal stated above. To be sure, this record and manual can serve only as a supplement to a systematic course of study. They go through too many levels of Russian—starting from the very elements and ending with poetry—to be used as an independent course. The phonetic introduction is also far short of being adequate without an additional text.

The defects noted in this manual-record set are of a minor nature. The pronunciation of several letter names does not correspond to Soviet practice. The л, for example, is transcribed (p. 2) and pronounced as [el] rather than the correct [el']. The manual indicates that the softening of Russian consonants depends on the following vowel (p. 6). Actually, of course, the consonants in themselves are either hard or soft. Many vowels simply mark the hardness or softness of preceding consonants. The alleged contrast between the д in "duke" and "do" (p. 6) is non-existent for most native speakers of American English. Both д's are one phoneme. The same holds for the н in "new" and "nose" (ibid.) and the т in "time" and "top" (p. 8).

Morton Benson
University of Pennsylvania

George E. Condoyannis. Scientific Russian. New York: John Wiley and Sons [c. 1959]. xii, 225, \$3.50.

In the Preface to Scientific Russian, the author states that the material in this book is presented "in a form specifically tailored to the reading aim" and that such an aim is analytic in nature. In addition, the author states that, since the Russian language is readily presented in tables, this possibility has been used to the fullest advantage. The need for actual practice with an uncut text and dictionary, as well as a text such as Scientific Russian, is reiterated throughout the Preface.

Obviously, all of these goals form a sound basis on which to approach the study of the Russian language from the viewpoint of gaining a reading knowledge of technical Russian material. Unfortunately, Mr. Condoyannis' book does not attain such goals. The very organization of the book is faulty, and its hybrid nature tends to make it fall short of its avowed purpose. The book is neither a concise manual useful to the student working alone nor a full-fledged textbook suitable for classroom use. On the one hand, the format is too disorganized for quick reference and, on the other, as stated by the author, the chapters are not lessons in the ordinary sense. As a reference manual, the work would have been strengthened by the omission of the exercises, since a person attempting the study of Russian on his own would have no way of judging his performance on such material.

Better organization of material would make the book far more useful. For instance, the basic adjective system is discussed in Chapter 3, but details on comparatives, superlatives, predicate adjectives, etc., do not appear until Chapter 9. Material on verbs appears in four different chapters which are scattered throughout the book.

This lack of organization is compounded by the fact that the book does not contain any detailed index. This omission forces the user of the book to resort to a meager table of contents and index of tables and lists, or, worse yet, to waste time paging through the book in pursuit of an elusive detail. The tables which the author has constructed are far too complicated for the beginner, and often the notes which concern these tables are found on their verso, necessitating time-consuming and awkward page-turning on the part of the student.

The tables concerning verbs are incredibly complicated and certainly would prove discouraging to the student, since a ratio of only one page of regular verbs to nineteen pages of irregular ones is presented in the Master Verb Table. This simply is not a true representation of the verb structure, since the Russian language is not characterized by a large number of irregular verbs but rather by a number of highly predictable minor variations on the two regular verb patterns. Finally, regardless of the format of the tables, they would have been more useful had they been assembled in an appendix rather than interlarded in the textual portions of the book.

The reading selections are well chosen, but they might better have been placed in a separate section for ease of use. No word list or glossary appears in conjunction with these reading exercises. This is a serious omission since it implies that the student must obtain a dictionary in order to translate this material. Since the purchase of an adequate dictionary usually entails a sizable cash outlay, the average student is reluctant to make such a purchase until he has had a chance to acquaint himself somewhat with the language. Moreover, the author gives no suggestions which might guide the student in so important an acquisition.

The sections on word building and on difficult words, as well as the list of high frequency words, are particularly helpful to the beginner. The physical aspects of the book, namely its near-pocket-book size, spiral binding, and excellent type make it pleasant to handle and use.

While not recommended as a basic manual for the beginner, Scientific Russian could find a place in a private collection of texts on technical Russian and would certainly be a useful adjunct to the collections of university and public libraries.

Lorraine T. Kapitanoff
Pennsylvania State University

Yar Slavutych. Conversational Ukrainian, II. Edmonton, Winnipeg: Gateway Publishers Ltd. viii, 369-610 pages. \$3.50.

This textbook is a continuation of Professor Slavutych's Conversational Ukrainian, I, published in May 1959 and intended for use in high school, colleges, and for self-study. The first volume of Conversational Ukrainian, containing fifty lessons, has been very well received as can be seen from a large number of favorable reviews in the press and professional journals (see The Slavic and East European Journal, 1960, No. 1, and The Modern Language Journal, January and April issues, 1960).

Both volumes, as the author expressed in his Foreword to Volume I, are based on three fundamental ideas: (1) to present the contemporary Ukrainian language as it is used in everyday conversation; (2) to give the student a concise knowledge of Ukraine, its geography, history and culture as well as its language; (3) to give some information about Ukrainians who live in Canada and in the United States of America.

Although the author reduced the number of lessons in his second volume from fifty to twenty-five (lessons 51 to 75), as originally planned, he has succeeded in attaining the above-mentioned aims. These lessons systematically cover a wide field of essential information about Ukraine's territory, population, history, language, folklore, literature, civilization, and culture in general.

Two lessons cover a general survey of Ukrainian history from the early beginnings to the present. In his introduction to the three lessons dealing with the historical aspect of the language, Professor Slavutych outlines briefly the relationship among the Indo-European languages, and of Slavic languages in particular, defining thus the position of the Ukrainian language in the latter's family group. These lessons cover the history of the language from the eleventh century to the present, listing some important early Ukrainian linguistic works and giving samples of the language through the centuries of its development. At the same time he presents the status of the language under foreign domination, and explains in the conclusion the principal differences between the orthography established by the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1929 and the modified one by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1946 (second edition, 1960).

Professor Slavutych dedicates five lessons to an excellent survey of Ukrainian literature. He paid proper attention to The Tale of Ihor's Campaign and to major literary figures, with some brief selections of their works. Most informative are Slavutych's lessons on the historical development of educational institutions, agriculture, industry, transportation, sports, and

foreign culture relations of the Ukraine. The final few lessons present some samples of the styles of technical, business, and legal language.

Each lesson of Conversational Ukrainian generally consists of the following parts: (a) a Ukrainian dialogue on the main topic of the lesson with the English translation, (b) the reading text, (c) a brief Ukrainian anecdote or a poem, (d) idiomatic expressions, (e) grammar, (f) homework consisting of translation exercises from English into Ukrainian and questions in Ukrainian to be answered by the student, and (g) vocabulary. Each verb is presented in both its imperfective and perfective aspects and is fully conjugated. Each noun is given in its nominative singular and plural forms. All Ukrainian words in the textbook are correctly stressed. To it is added a list of Ukrainian-English grammatical terms, an index to the grammar, and an index of words. The two volumes of Conversational Ukrainian give the student a vocabulary of slightly over four thousand Ukrainian words.

The great merit of Slavutych's textbook can be seen in the systematic presentation of carefully selected material in a crisp and flawless Ukrainian literary language. This textbook is by far the best of its kind ever to appear in the western hemisphere. Moreover, from the pedagogical and instructional points of view, it is one of the best of comparable textbooks of any Slavic language. Conversational Ukrainian will impart to the student both a systematic approach to the language and encyclopedic information on Ukrainian culture.

Both volumes of this textbook have been adopted by the Department of Education in Alberta for use in the senior grades of provincial high schools, as well as by a number of colleges and universities where instruction of Ukrainian is offered.

O. Starchuk
University of Alberta

Andreas v. Weiss. Hauptprobleme der Zweisprachigkeit: Eine Untersuchung auf Grund deutsch/estnischen Materials.
Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1959. 214 pp.

A. v. Weiss has analyzed a German and an Estonian essay, written in 1938 by about 400 students of German high schools in Estonia. From this material, as well as from comparison of same with data concerning the students' background, obtained from the students themselves, and also from their teachers, through a questionnaire and, in some cases, through follow-up inquiry, he seeks to establish a psychological pattern of bilingualism. A tabulation of errors made by the testees is the nucleus of the material which Weiss has extracted from these essays; however, they were also used by him to obtain information regarding the individuality of the writer.

Two basic types of errors are distinguished throughout the investigation: Errors demonstrably caused by interference of the other language (SM-Fehler), and violations of the idiomatic norm which could not be explained by such interference (IN-Fehler). Each testee was accordingly assigned to one of the following three

groups: (I) Individuals who showed a good mastery of both languages. No SM-Fehler were found in their essays. (II) Individuals who had a good mastery of one of the two languages, but were inferior in the other. SM-Fehler in this group were limited to one language. (III) Individuals who had SM-Fehler (and, of course, IN-Fehler) in both languages. The author then seeks to establish relations between an individual's belonging to any of the three groups, on the one hand, and a variety of factors, such as sex, parents' social status, intensity of contact with the (non-German) environment, nationality of parents, language(s) spoken at home, and linguistic history of testee, on the other. Also, the distribution of specific types of errors within the three groups is a possible connection between general linguistic proficiency and the relation of content vs. form of essay. Weiss believes that his data bear out the psychological reality of the three groups. In fact, he has attempted to draft an outline of their gestalt: An integrated mental structure, which makes for integral experience patterns, is typical of group I, whereas disintegrating tendencies are in evidence in the other two groups: Disintegration from within because of selective tendencies in integration of experience in the case of group II, and disintegration from without because of susceptibility of isolated emotional processes to random external stimuli in that of group III.

I feel that some fundamental objections can be made to Weiss' thesis. First, the student body of a German school in Estonia may have been, in 1938, too heterogeneous linguistically to permit a statistical approach such as that used. For instance, table 59, nationality of parents, distinguishes Germans, Estonians, and non-Germans (as well as non-Estonians). This leaves open such details as: If the parent was German, was he a Baltic German, a German from Germany, or a transient (from Russia)? In Weiss' statistics, a parent just arrived from Nazi Germany as a refugee is not distinguished from a Baltic German born and raised in the country. Also, the recently "Germanized" Estonians (and Latvians) apparently appear as Germans, although linguistically there would be, in many cases, a difference between them and Germans of old standing. Apparently, such details could not be considered, because they would have made classification of material exceedingly complex.

Second, I think that Weiss has underestimated the importance of those deviations from the norm of both literary German and literary Estonian which had become normalized in sub-standard speech. In der Langstrasse baut man ein grosses Haus is incorrect (s/b ... wird ein grosses Haus gebaut), and is, absolutely speaking, an SM-Fehler, as it coincides with the respective Estonian construction; however, it certainly was the norm in sub-standard Estonian German usage, so that a given individual could well acquire and use it without any direct influence of the Estonian equivalent. The same is true of several other types of SM-Fehler mentioned by Weiss. Similarly, sub-standard Estonian could show traits that would have to be classed as outright Germanisms. Here too, a testee could be charged with an SM-Fehler for merely following the normal usage of his environment.

It is possible that what Weiss has taken for psychological types or attitudes are merely reflections of social configurations.

In particular, students belonging to group III would be from homes where sub-standard German—and/or sub-standard Estonian!—was spoken, i. e., homes in which little emphasis was placed on linguistic culture. The fact that percentage of testees belonging to that group is relatively much higher among students of "lower" social background corroborates such an interpretation.

A distinct weakness of the book lies in the fact that the author's knowledge of Estonian was imperfect, so that he had to rely on his collaborators (undergraduate students). The rather numerous errors in the limited Estonian quotations indicate that the students' mastery of that language was not perfect, either. This, in turn, reflects upon reliability of the Estonian portion of the whole investigation.

V. Terras
University of Illinois

Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. American Studies in Uralic Linguistics. (Uralic and Altaic Series, I.) Bloomington: Indiana University, 1960. vii, 356, \$4.00.

The appearance of the first volume of Indiana University's Uralic and Altaic Series is a promising beginning to what one hopes will be a new era in Ural-Altaic studies in the United States. Especially noteworthy is the application of most recent methods of structural linguistics to representatives of a language family which has in the past been the object mainly of diachronic studies. There is no break with the past, however: the historical studies in the volume maintain the high standards characteristic of the tradition of Uralic studies. The volume, which contains contributions from almost all the Uralic scholars in the United States, will, however, not be of interest only to Uralicists, for the theoretical implications of many of the articles are of concern to linguists in general.

Of the twelve papers in the volume, nine deal with the Finnic branch of Uralic, two with the Ugric (Hungarian), and one with all the languages of the Finno-Ugric family. A more complete representation of Ugric studies could perhaps have been desired, as well as a sampling of work on the third branch of Uralic, Samoyed. As it is, "Studies in Finno-Ugric Linguistics" would have made a more accurate title. It is to be hoped that following volumes of the series will fill the "structural gaps" in this one.

The predominance of Finnic in this volume is to a great extent explained by the fact that Cheremis, a Finnic language of European Russia, has long been the object of special study at Indiana University. Four of the papers hark back directly or indirectly to the years 1952-54, when the dialect of Iwan Jewski, an Eastern Cheremis informant, was extensively studied at Indiana University. Frances Ingemann examines the morphophonemic alternations of East Cheremis; Eeva K. Minn presents a new solution to the functional difference of the two past tenses of Cheremis; Elaine K. Ristinen analyzes the East Cheremis phonology, using in her distributional statements the tables

formulated by F. Harary and H. H. Paper in their article, "Toward a General Calculus of Phonemic Distribution" (Language, 1957); and finally, Valdis J. Zeps offers "an initial statement towards a structural typology of Cheremis dialects," based on distinctive feature analysis. Thomas A. Sebeok, the editor of the volume, completes the Cheremis cycle with his "Eighteenth Century Cheremis: The Evidence from Pallas," which provides colorful historical background for these papers as well as a transliterated and glossed Cheremis word list from the eighteenth century. Altogether, the Cheremis articles form a pleasing unity, with their differing emphases and their interconnections.

Robert Austerlitz' "Two Nascent Affective Suffixes in Finnish?" is distinguished by its attention to modern colloquial (Helsinki) Finnish, and Robert T. Harms's contribution to the analysis of Finnish stress and juncture is most welcome as an essay in an area that has been almost completely lacking in Finnish linguistics. Ilse Lehiste's paper on segmental and syllabic quantity in Estonian applies acoustic data to the old and much-discussed problem of whether there are two or three phonemic quantities in Estonian, and concludes that there are three, Trubetzkoy's principles notwithstanding. A concern with the structure of the spoken language is also evident in John Lotz's study of the imperative system in spoken and written Hungarian and their relationship: a type of study which has received little attention in spite of its obvious usefulness, and which is here presented with admirable economy and clarity.

Felix J. Oinas' paper on the relationship of certain kinds of concord in Balto-Finnic and preposition repetition in Russian is particularly interesting in its implications for the theory of linguistic diffusion, dealing as it does with an instance of syntactic influence which has taken place in spite of an apparent structural "incommensurability" of the two constructions involved. Of special interest to the Turcologist is Nicholas Poppe's neat demonstration that early Turkic loanwords in Hungarian must stem from at least three separate Turkic languages.

The weightiest study in the collection is Alo Raun's "The Equivalents of English 'Than' in Finno-Ugric," a part of his dissertation and the result of over thirty years' interest in the subject, and which fills one hundred pages. It is a complete survey of comparative constructions in all the Finno-Ugric languages, thoroughly illustrated with examples and carefully documented. The main attention is on syntax: all different constructions are examined and where two or more types appear in the same language, an attempt is made "to establish some difference in their use either synchronically or diachronically, on a dialectal or other basis."

In the Foreword, Frederick Burkhardt of the ACLS gives a brief history of Uralic and Altaic studies in the United States, emphasizing that they "are relatively new in this country and have up to the present been carried on by a relatively small group of scholars." The present volume is "welcome . . . , both as testimony to the contribution of American scholars to the field and as another landmark in the development of a significant branch of learning in this country." It is only to be wished that companion volumes in the series will soon follow.

Meri Lehtinen
Indiana University

- G. Glison. Vvedenie v deskriptivnuju lingvistiku. Moscow, 1959. 486 pp. (Russian translation of Henry A. Gleason, Jr., An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics [New York, 1955].) Translated by E. S. Kubrjakova and V. P. Murat, edited and with a Preface by V. A. Zvegincev.

Although Soviet scholars, especially in subjects like linguistics and English studies, may naturally be expected to have a command of the literature on their subject produced in the U. S. A., it is very seldom that an American work such as Gleason's receives wide-spread attention in the U. S. S. R., and for one to be translated into Russian is a remarkable occurrence. (A few other books on linguistic topics that have merited such treatment have been listed in Central Asiatic Journal, Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 220, footnote 3.)

This Russian edition is preceded by a preface on Descriptive Linguistics by V. A. Zvegincev (pp. 5-26), in which the development of this method is reviewed. The author discusses Boas, Sapir, and Bloomfield, and goes on to mention more recent figures, displaying his acquaintance with all the recent American works in linguistics. He considers at length the treatment of meaning by the American school, and concludes by saying that, although Gleason's book was not meant to be original, but a teaching aid, it gives a systematic exposition of all basic problems, and avoids extremes.

Next occurs Gleason's original Preface (pp. 27-29), but only that portion from the beginning to his original p. vii, line 7; the balance, concerning the assignment of chapters and listing his various acknowledgments, is omitted for the Russian reader. The chapters of Gleason's work are then translated in order. In general, it is a faithful and accurate translation without distortions or misunderstandings, although translating certain terms did pose difficulties. As descriptive linguistics is a new methodology, the translators apparently felt the need to make a break with previous linguistic tradition, and create new terminology for the Russian language. This attempt is reflected in the choice of title for the translation, viz., not Vvedenie v opisatel'noe jazykoznanie as one might expect, but using borrowed words: deskriptivnaja lingvistika.

The Russian equivalents for many of the termini technici so beloved by American linguists are not too surprising in some cases, but, in others, it is interesting to note their choice of words, which will no doubt set the standard for usage in this field for some time. In the case of some words, like 'phoneme, which we owe to Russian and to Baudouin de Courtenay as much as we do to Greek, or other familiar faces like 'allomorph,' the equivalents fonema and allomorfa are to be expected. Some others, like minimal'nye pary 'minimal pairs,' otkrytyj perexod 'open transition,' slogovoe jadro 'syllabic nucleus,' and zamestitel' 'replative,' are rather much what one would expect. Other coinages of interest are intonacionnyj risunok 'intonation contour,' zaversiteli predlozenij 'clause terminals,' and neposredstvenno sostavljajuscie 'immediate constituents,' of which the abbreviation IC is, not surprisingly, given as NS (Cyrillic HC).

In the course of translating the work, the translators frequently felt it necessary to add the original English word for clarity, as in the case of the pitch levels: nizkij (low), srednij

(mid), vysokij (high) and sverxvysokij (extra high), or of dopolnitel'naja distributsija (complementary distribution), but not for funktsional'naja nagruzka 'functional load.' Interesting too is podobnyj glasnomu for 'vocaloid,' and the choice of izbytočnost' for 'redundancy.' In the case of binit, the English word has been taken over as binit, and in the case of 'glide,' the translators, after glossing it as skol'zjaščij èlement, zvuk skol'ženija use the English word glajd. However, as for the general run of phonetic and grammatical terms, as customarily found in Russian works on grammar and syntax, few if any innovations are to be found in physiological terms, terms of descriptive phonetics, or names of cases and parts of speech (see for instance Chapter 14 on articulatory phonetics).

Since many of Gleason's examples are drawn from or based on a feature of English, it is a virtual necessity for the Russian reader to have some command of English in order to profit from the book. Occasionally footnotes clarify what might still be baffling to a Russian reader, as the footnote on p. 84 explaining the sentence "That white bird is an albino blackbird." In one case, a sentence from Gleason's text has been transferred to a footnote in the Russian text (R., p. 210; E., p. 147), but no harm is done. I presume the translators knew what a 'World Series game' is (E., p. 127; R., p. 184), but to save a long explanation, simply called it [opisanie] olimpijskix igr and added the English phrase after it. Typographical errors in the English are few: I note only hapen, occurence, and moter for happen, occurrence, and mother on pp. 10, 16, and 309. The general format and the reproduction of tables has turned out very well, in spite of demanding requirements. I note they have furnished Chinese characters and Japanese kana in type for Gleason's handwritten ones (pp. 403, 406, 407, 408), and that the numbering system so dear to American linguists (21.16) has been replaced by a simple §16 under Chapter 21. For some reason, the name of George L. Trager has become standardized in Russian as Trejdžer, and Martin Joos (rhymes with gross) comes out as Džuz.

At the end of the book, I note that Gleason's "Selected Bibliography" (pp. 373-378) together with his other remarks on linguistic study have not been included, although his Notes of pp. 379-380 are (R., pp. 482 f.). The Russian edition also lacks an index, which Gleason's contains; it would seem that this surely would have been worth the effort to compile it. The Workbook which accompanies Gleason's text is dismissed (p. 25) as not suited to Russian teaching goals, but the problems in making a new edition of it would not seem insurmountable. The principles of analysis remain the same.

The appearance of this important textbook in a Russian translation is not only indicative of the great interest in modern linguistic methods as pioneered and developed in America, it also gives hope that it will bring really fresh insights to Russian scholars of language by enabling them to cast off some of their rigid traditionalist upbringing in language study. Whether we can expect them to progress soon so far as to translate the works of Jakobson is another matter, but at least this is a beginning.

John R. Krueger
Portland, Oregon

Nelson Brooks. Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. [c. 1960]. xiii, 238, \$3.50.

The need for reform in foreign language teaching methods was brought into sharp focus during World War II. At that time, when large numbers of servicemen had to learn foreign languages quickly, a drastic break with traditional teaching methods was made. Many teaching centers introduced the new aural-oral intensive method, based on the doctrines developed by descriptive linguists. The aural-oral approach has left a strong imprint on post-war methodology, and its influence is still rapidly growing. Unfortunately, however, the champions of the new method and the traditionalists have, to a great extent, remained blind to each other's virtues.

The purpose of the book under review is to describe the theory and practice of the aural-oral method and to point out how it differs from the traditional method. Evidently, the book is intended for foreign language teachers and school administrators. It includes discussions of the following topics: theory of language, basic concepts of linguistics (the phoneme, the morpheme, linguistic change), language learning, language teaching, language and culture, language and literature, objectives and continuity of foreign language courses, methods and materials, the language laboratory, tests and measurements, and the establishment of standards for the profession of foreign language teaching. The discussion of linguistic matters is on an elementary level. Language and Language Learning has two appendices. One describes procedures for coping with specific classroom problems. The second is a glossary of terms used in foreign language teaching and linguistics.

To describe the basic subject of his book, the author proposes the neologism linguistics. He defines this term as: "the theory and practice of language and language learning. It is an interdisciplinary field extending into many areas of study, notably philosophy, philology, literature, psychology, linguistics, anthropology, and pedagogy." Another new term proposed by Professor Brooks is audio-lingual, which would replace aural-oral. The latter two words are almost identical in the pronunciation of most Americans. The adoption of these neologisms, or equivalent terms, is recommended by this reviewer.

Language and Language Learning sharply attacks traditional methods of foreign language instruction. The author censures especially the traditional reliance on reading and translation as the basic method of teaching a foreign language. Other targets for attack are the stress on grammatical analysis, over-emphasis on writing and the written form of language, and excessive use of English in the classroom. Professor Brooks advocates the recognition of foreign language learning as the acquisition of "non-thoughtful responses," i. e., of habits that have become automatic as the result of repeated drill. A good foreign language course should begin, in the author's opinion, with concentrated pronunciation and conversation drill. Only after several months of such drill does the student move on to reading and writing. Much attention is paid throughout the course to the culture and customs of the country whose language is being

learned. Repeated drills of various types are conducted at each lesson. The use of English is kept to a minimum.

In general, Language and Language Learning gives a clear presentation of the aural-oral method of foreign language teaching. As a basic introductory guide to modern methodology this book will be of value, especially to new and future foreign language instructors. However, it will not offer much that is new to those teachers who have followed recent literature on methodology. Nor will it succeed in converting the confirmed traditionalist to its viewpoint.

To be sure, the author presents his viewpoint very forcibly. In fact, herein lies the main defect of the book, for too often it gives only one approach to problems about which there is much disagreement among foreign language teachers. Of course one cannot expect a book intended as an introductory text on methodology to discuss exhaustively all sides of every question. However, one does expect a book on methodology to indicate at least the existence of disagreement regarding a given question whenever such disagreement is serious. The chapter on language laboratories, for example, does not point to the deep differences of opinion and uncertainties which plague foreign language departments concerning the use of laboratories. Another example of this one-sided approach is the insistence upon delaying use of the traditional writing system until several months of spoken drill have elapsed (pp. 48-49). In the opinion of many foreign language teachers, the desirability of this delay has not yet been demonstrated objectively. It might be added that an objective investigation of this question would be of special interest to teachers of Russian.

Morton Benson
University of Pennsylvania

Felix J. Oinas, ed. Language Teaching Today: Report of the Language Laboratory Conference Held at Indiana University, January 22-23, 1960. (Publications of the Indiana University Research Center, 14.) Bloomington, Ind., 1960. xii, 221, \$4.00.

This report, edited by Professor Oinas, was published as Volume 26, Number 4 (October, 1960) of the International Journal of American Linguistics. It presents, with only slight editorial changes, the papers and discussions of the Language Laboratory Conference held at Indiana University in January 1960. Describing the conference in the Foreword, Professor William Riley Parker states that "it was held to discuss the theoretical problems in audiovisual teaching of foreign languages as centered in the language laboratory, or, to put it still more precisely, the aim was to bring together a group of outstanding experts in this field—linguists, psychologists, and language teachers—and to make it possible for them to communicate to fellow-teachers and administrators something of their knowledge and experience."

The following list of the papers printed will indicate the scope of this publication: "The National Situation in the Field

of Language Laboratories," Joseph C. Hutchinson; "Future Prospects of Language Teaching with the Use of Language Laboratories," Elton Hocking; "Equipment for the Language Laboratory," William N. Locke; "Language Laboratory Techniques: The Teacher and the Language Laboratory," A. Bruce Gaarder; "Language Laboratory Methods and Techniques," Fernand Marty; "Testing Students' Progress in the Language Laboratory," Pierre Delattre; "A Title III Language Laboratory—Planning, Use, and Evaluation," Herbert J. Reese; "One City's Solution to the Language Laboratory Problem," M. Phillip Leamon; "The Impact of Title III on Foreign Language Study in Indiana," George E. Smith; "The Language Laboratory as a Teaching Machine," F. Rand Morton; "Special Problems in Programming Language Instruction for Teaching Machines," B. F. Skinner; "The Use of Visual Materials in the Teaching of French," LaVelle Rosselot; "What is the Audio-Visual Score Now?" George Borglum.

Language Teaching Today is an extremely welcome publication. It should be read by every foreign language teacher interested in language laboratories and by every linguist concerned with the practical application of linguistics. First of all, it points out the problems and conflicts involved in setting up and using language laboratories. Then, it describes the progress which has been made in the last decade. Finally, it delineates the possibilities for the future.

It is impossible to discuss within the limits of a review all the questions treated in Language Teaching Today. Therefore, only several selected items will be mentioned to illustrate the conflicts, progress, and future possibilities in the area of language laboratories.

One striking example of a disagreement concerning language laboratories is the attitude of instructors toward the value of student recording. Some specialists feel that student recording and relistening is not worth while (pp. 70-71). Others take precisely the opposite viewpoint (p. 29).

Another problem lies in the area of pronunciation testing. Professor Delattre's paper presents a detailed scheme for testing pronunciation by the use of tapes in the laboratory. One remark appearing in the Comments to this paper (p. 94) points, however, to a basic weakness in the whole scheme. Even though the laboratory enables a whole class to record their test simultaneously, each test still must be graded individually. The laboratory cannot save time here. The commentator asks why not therefore test pronunciation by personal interview? Many would agree that the latter procedure, without the help of any laboratory, is much simpler and less expensive.

An example of the successful use of a language laboratory is described in Professor Rosselot's paper. In Professor Rosselot's French course at Otterbein College, the only classroom material used is a so-called Film-Text. Homework is based on drill in the language laboratory—imitating and learning the sound track, self-checking exercises, etc. Laboratory work is fully integrated in this course with the classroom work. Professor Rosselot reports that the results have been excellent.

The papers of Professors Morton and Skinner on the Language Laboratory Teaching Machine (LLTM) are interesting for the future. The LLTM would apparently eventually replace the teacher at the elementary level by providing the student with a

complete library of tapes which he could work through at his own speed. After mastering the material offered by the LLTM, the student would go on to conventional advanced courses. It is easy to see why some teachers view the LLTM with suspicion and fear. Others are enthusiastic.

Within the last ten years there has been a great increase of language laboratories in American colleges. There has been an even more rapid increase of laboratory facilities in American high schools as a result of Title III of the N. D. E. A. This expansion, along with the existence of serious disagreements among foreign language teachers regarding the use of laboratories, makes further research and discussion imperative. In conclusion, it can be stated that Language Teaching Today makes a welcome contribution in this direction.

Morton Benson
University of Pennsylvania

Melville J. Ruggles and Vaclav Mostecky. Russian and East European Publications in the Libraries of the United States. (Columbia University Studies in Library Service, No. 11.) New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. xv, 396, \$10.00.

The title of this work may suggest that it is a listing and an analysis of the holdings of the Russian and East European publications in the libraries of the United States. Actually, the authors go further. Their aim, stated in the Introduction, is as follows: "The objectives of this study are to survey the existing collections of East European materials in American libraries, to describe and analyze the techniques employed in the handling of these materials, and to recommend possible improvements. The evaluation and the recommendations are based not only on current library practices and current use of East European publications, but on an estimate of future needs of the research community." Thus the listing of materials becomes only the starting point. It is the evaluation of those publications and the recommendations suggested by the authors which make this book truly valuable.

The discussion dwells mainly on the humanities and the social sciences. The materials of natural science and technology, to be sure, are listed and form an integral part of the study. However, in the discussion of these materials, e. g., regarding suggestions for solving the special problems of access to sources of information in science and technology, the reader will find serious gaps and omissions. This narrowness in scope was due to the limitation of time and funds; the authors recommend a similar study emphasizing the fields in which they are unable to do justice to their subject.

By East European publications the authors understand monographs, periodicals, serials, newspapers, maps, sheet music, phonograph records, and all kinds of prints issued "anywhere in those parts of Eastern Europe which are at present under Soviet domination." East Germany and, with minor exceptions, Yugoslavia are excluded. The study concentrates

on the present geographical boundaries of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania. The stress is on the Soviet Union.

The study is based on the questionnaires sent at the end of 1957 to all college and university libraries with holdings of 50,000 or more, and to all public libraries with at least 250,000 volumes. Out of 1,403 questionnaires sent, 1,035 were returned. Most of the libraries which ignored the questionnaire had no or only negligible holdings of interest to the investigators. It may be reasonably assumed that the study is based on the real situation in American libraries as of the autumn of 1957.

If the investigators were satisfied with the collecting of data and figures alone, this study would have been out of date as soon as it came off the press. It is because of the approach of the authors to their subject that the study not only has not lost its value, but it comes as a timely and helpful tool. The authors state realistically that in most libraries, particularly in university libraries, there is no clearly determined acquisition policy with regard to the materials in question. Our investigators are not satisfied with the stating of the fact and substantiating it. They also do tell us how to remedy the situation.

The study is divided into three parts. Part I, "Building a Collection," deals with the selection of materials and their acquisition. Part II, "Organizing and Exploiting the Materials," concerns cataloguing and bibliographical control. Part III is devoted to a "Survey of Resources"; it is a descriptive analysis of the Russian and East European collections in general, and a discussion of the quality of the individual Russian collections in particular.

The data and figures themselves as collected on the basis of the questionnaire returns are neatly presented in 30 appendices. Material that can be best shown in tabular form is given in thirteen tables with such headings, as, e. g., "Decimal Classification Breakdown of Periodical Titles Listed by the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions."

The volume may serve a useful purpose as a reference work in all American libraries with Russian and East European holdings. It is also a well-written and excellently organized textbook for all interested in the publications of that region.

George J. Maciuszko
Cleveland Public Library

George Z. F. Bereday and Jaan Pennar. The Politics of Soviet Education. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1960]. vi, 217, \$6.00.

This book of eleven essays is the fruit of a seminar on Soviet education which met in Munich during July 1958. Its contributors include American, West European, and East European (refugee) scholars. Because a major reform of the Soviet school system was initiated after 1958 (beginning with the academic year 1959-1960), all of the essays have been revised—some of them extensively—to take account of recent developments.

The quality of the eleven contributions is far from uniform. The introductory paper by Ramazan Karça, like those on "polytechnical" (i.e., vocational) education by Richard Rapacz and Party control by Pennar, is straightforward and informative, but offers no new facts or interpretations. Fr. Alessio Floridi's essay on anti-religious education is rather thin, and includes the doubtful claim that "everyone in Leningrad knows that [contrary to the official Soviet interpretation] Pavlov was a deeply religious man" (p. 94). William Medlin's paper on history teaching is prolix and a bit pretentious. Irene Mareuil offers a good deal of information about Soviet extracurricular activities, and throws fresh light on the inadequacy of summer-camp (Pioneer) facilities. Norton Dodge and Burton Rubin contribute businesslike accounts of the organization of Soviet higher education, including the training of secondary-school teachers.

But the most substantial contributions, those with the broadest theoretical perspective, and the most interesting (if sometimes controversial) interpretations, are Bereday's article on class tensions in Soviet education, David Burg's report on foreign-language teaching, and Mark Field's sociological investigation of access to higher education.

Bereday distinguishes between the "class tensions" which arise in egalitarian societies and the "mass ferment" of inegalitarian societies. The egalitarianism of the Soviet educational system, he argues, draws its support from "the comprehensive school structure, common curriculum, and coeducation" (p. 67). But Bereday also notes a series of strongly anti-egalitarian factors in the Soviet school system. His conclusion—like Field's—appears to be that a new period of increased egalitarianism is now imminent. This seems to me dubious, but the question cannot be definitively settled before the completion of the current school reforms in 1965.

Burg efficiently disposes of several misconceptions concerning language teaching in the Soviet Union: Russians, he says, are not specially gifted—as is often assumed—but the Tsarist Gymnasium had first-rate, often native, foreign-language teachers. The inadequacy of present-day Soviet language instruction is due primarily to poorly trained teachers; the circle of imperfection is vicious and self-perpetuating. Paradoxically, under Stalin, "a foreign language was to be taught but not learned" (p. 123). On the one hand, knowledge of foreign languages was essential to the cultivation of science and technology, but on the other hand, it provided an avenue of access to dangerous "alien ideologies." The consequence was that living languages were treated as though they were dead. Students used them primarily as material for "mental exercise." This tension and ambiguity in the official Soviet attitude toward foreign-language instruction continues, although in somewhat mitigated form.

Field's paper sketches a broad background of Parsonian sociological theory against which to set the facts of Soviet higher education. All societies require a dual "maintenance" mechanism, expressed on the one hand in education and on the other in medicine, including psychiatry. "Education develops the capacity to achieve . . . , medicine conserves this capacity" (p. 176). The transmission of social status involves "transmission of access

to education" (p. 178). In this context Field predicts increased equalization of access to Soviet higher education, together with increased concern for public (including mental) health, in the years to come.

The editing of the volume is careful and conscientious, but there are a few inconsistencies of style and discrepancies of substance. For example, Bereday speaks of the "pervasive hold of Soviet ideological preachings" (p. 62): similar claims are made elsewhere. But Field quotes with approval the more accurate assessment of Adlai Stevenson: "student interest in Communist ideology and in the required indoctrination courses is languid at best" (p. 183).

Again, the *pedagogičeskij institut*, which most of the contributors call in English "pedagogical institute," is repeatedly and confusingly referred to in David Burg's article as "normal school." Perhaps "teachers college" would have been preferable to both of these renderings. The English style is often awkward (e.g., pp. 26, 36, 111, 116, 139) and there are a number of—mostly minor—errors (e.g., pp. 15, 35, 36, 59, 76, 84, 115, 198, 202). Misprints occur on pp. 86, 192, 194, 205.

Despite its shortcomings, *The Politics of Soviet Education* contains much of interest and importance. In particular, the papers of Bereday, Burg, and Field will repay close study. But their generalizations and predictions concerning the future direction of developments in Soviet educational policy and practice will have to be re-examined in the light of the school reforms as they actually crystallize over the next five years.

George L. Kline
Bryn Mawr College

Joseph M. Kirschbaum. *Slovakia: Nation at the Crossroads of Central Europe*. New York: Robert Speller and Sons [c. 1960]. xix, 371, \$5.00.

Munich and the February Coup in Czechoslovakia each proved a shock and also an eye-opener to the Western world and consequently, a good deal of scholarly attention has been given to, and books in English written about, this country of East Central Europe. While most writers would seem to agree that this Versailles' new-born child is a fact geographically, a marriage culturally, a chimera politically, the book of Professor Kirschbaum, who teaches in the Slavic Department of the University of Montreal, proclaims and makes an issue of the chimerical aspect of it. He says that "Czecho-Slovakia is the only state in the world that owes its origin to propaganda" (p. 86).

Kirschbaum is a noted Slovak separatist who played an active part, mainly in the diplomatic service, on behalf of the Slovak State during World War II; it is from this point of view and background that he approaches his subject. The first part of the book provides the historical background of Slovakia, by combining the various aspects of the struggle of a small nation to preserve its ethnic identity, cultural autonomy, and political rights against Magyar and later Czech designs to dominate her.

The chapter entitled "Western Historians and the True Face of Slovakia" seems to challenge stereotyped views of some writers who, looking through the glasses of "official" Czech propaganda, have persistently portrayed Slovakia as an economically backward and culturally retarded country. This reviewer thinks, however, that while this is a laudable objective, the author is fighting historical windmills. Checking the sources from which the author quotes in support of his purported fact-finding with regard to the number of schools in Slovakia at the end of the Hungarian rule (1918), as compared to 1939, one discovers that he draws misleading conclusions from the given data. The same goes with the question of high illiteracy before 1918, as compared to illiteracy in the non-Hungarian, especially Czech, provinces at that time.

In the second part of the book the author seeks to break out of what he considers to have been an overly narrow, nay, fallacious concept of a "Czecho-Slovak nation," promulgated mainly by Beneš. According to Kirschbaum, it was this very dogma exercised in the field of politics (but not in economic application) by a centralistic regime of Prague which contributed to the disintegration of Czechoslovakia. Here, because the author does not come to grips with the fundamentals other than internal, namely encroaching Nazism, his analysis remains incomplete. This is seen also in his discussion of the role of Germany in the formation and existence of the Slovak Republic, which no doubt set limits for Slovak domestic social and political life. One would expect more of an effort to present the facts in a detached and unemotional way.

The last section of the book offers a picture which is generally more convincing for a student of East Central Europe. The documentary part contains interesting and valuable material which enhances the usefulness of the book. As a whole, the book of Kirschbaum represents an effort to appraise the past accomplishments and potentialities of the Slovak people. As such, it is perhaps more thoughtful and realistic than most recent writings on the topic, though it is presented in a popular rather than scholarly style.

Milan Karpát
Indiana University

Tamás Aczél and Tibor Méray. The Revolt of the Mind: A Case History of Intellectual Resistance Behind the Iron Curtain. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1959. xiv, 449, \$5.00.

If one wants to find the antecedents of the Hungarian revolution of 1956, or wants to find an answer to the question whether the revolution was prepared for intellectually or otherwise, he should read this book. The struggle of the Communist intelligentsia is told here by two leading members of this very group. Aczél was one of the two Hungarian writers who won the Stalin Prize, while Méray, a talented reporter in his own right, became "famous" in Budapest for his vicious accounts of American

"germ warfare" in Korea. After the Soviet intervention in November 1956, they both left for the West; since then, Méray has published an interesting portrait of Imre Nagy which bore the rather sensational title Thirteen Days That Shook the Kremlin.

Unfortunately, the title of this book is also quite misleading. Aczél and Méray, as they point out themselves, attempt to discuss only the revolt of the Communist mind, while the present title suggests something different. They do not describe the revolt of the Hungarian intelligentsia in general; such outstanding populist writers, for example, as Gyula Illyés, László Németh, and Aron Tamási are hardly mentioned.

The heroes of this volume are a new generation of Hungarian writers and journalists who began to write after World War II, more specifically, after the Communist take-over of 1947-48. Most of them in their twenties; they were converted because of their thirst for a faith, because society in Hungary after the war disintegrated, and because, being mostly Jews, they had had no role in politics before. The authors tell why and how these young intellectuals devoted their energy and erudition to the Communist cause.

For the Western reader, the most novel part will be the description of their "change of mind." According to Aczél and Méray, the earthquake for the young Communist intelligentsia was Stalin's death, while Prime Minister Rákosi's replacement in July 1953 by Imre Nagy is called the real turning point. But other events and factors were also involved. For example, young writers were becoming increasingly disgusted with such Soviet-inspired decisions as the cessation of the playing of Béla Bartók's works for many years. With a good sense of bitter humor the authors describe the artificial Sovietization of Hungarian life; they quote students who were taught that the real inventors of radio and air travel and what-not were all Russians, "who had to remain nameless because the criminal politics of Czarist Russia had prevented their names from becoming known."

The Revolt of the Mind leads the reader up to the revolution. It gives an excellent account of the role of the Writer's Union, the Petöfi Circle, and the writers' weekly, Irodalmi Ujság. One feels the atmosphere of these years of revolt, when the Hungarian Communist (ex-Communist?) intelligentsia spoke out quite bravely, and wrote in spite of the Party, although not necessarily in final opposition to it. Also, some documents are published in this volume for the first time, for example, the intellectuals' important Memorandum to the Party's Central Committee which was submitted in 1955 (!) and signed by the cream of the Communist intelligentsia.

The authors, to be sure, could not discuss all the significant factors involved. One would, however, expect a better analysis of the role and effect of Tito and Yugoslavia in the formation of these events, especially because Titoism was—and to a certain extent probably still is—a possibility for Hungary's future. One would also object to the silence about the Jewish question—which in a country where anti-Semitism has such deep roots and where the leaders of the Party (Rákosi, Gerő, Farkas, Révai) and most leaders of the writers' opposition (Déry, Háy, Gimes, the authors themselves) were Jews—can hardly be overemphasized.

On the whole, The Revolt of the Mind is a competent behind-the-scenes account of what was going on in those years. The book reads easily, and so far it is the best cultural, sociological, and historical report of the 1956 revolution.

Charles G. Gati
Indiana University

Lauri Honko. Krankheitsprojekteile: Untersuchung über eine ur-sinnliche Krankheitserklärung. (FFCommunications, No. 178.) Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1959. 258 pp., FM. 800.

This is a study of one of the world-wide explanations of disease, Projektilerklärung, by a young Finnish scholar Lauri Honko. The term Projektil is coined by the author and cannot possibly be adopted in English; the corresponding term is "intrusive object," used, e.g., by Forrest E. Clements in his compact survey of disease explanations, Primitive Concepts of Disease. Honko has partly based his study on materials compiled by Clements: for example, his maps showing the distribution areas of the most important disease concepts derive from this source. Honko states that he does not agree with Clements as to the definitions of some concepts and has thus made corrections in the distribution areas, but he does not give any kind of index to the maps, and hence, makes the reliability of his areas a matter of faith.

This, however, is not something that would affect the study in itself: the brief survey of the characteristics and distribution areas of breach of taboo, soul loss, and possession belongs to the introductory section of the work (pp. 23-37). The treatise of the Projektilerklärung is divided into two parts: first, Honko discusses the concept on its global basis; secondly, he focuses the study on his own country, Finland. The first half, research on the distribution of the Projektilerklärung (pp. 41-82) is, of course, less detailed than the latter (pp. 83-190). However, it provides a good background which throws light on many phenomena in the rich Finnish Projektil tradition.

Honko makes use of ancient literary sources, e.g., the scriptures of old high religions. Here he sometimes fails to distinguish between texts which reveal the concept of Projektilerklärung and pure imagery which cannot be used as evidence. For example, to show that the concept of object intrusion was current in Judaism, he quotes the following Bible verse (Eph. 6: 6): "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." The dart, as well as the shield, is here a metaphor, and this metaphorical meaning could certainly be reached without any concept of disease as an intermitter.

The bulk of the study lies in the scrutiny of Finnish materials. Honko makes use of many kinds of folklore items: memorates told by people who still remember epidemic diseases which were explained with the help of the Projektilerklärung; legends; descriptions of cures observed by collectors; magic formulas

(Zaubersprüche). Honko distinguishes three groups of diseases for which the concept has been valid: "Shot" or "flight" (Geschoss und Flug, pp. 83-118); "sting" (Stich, pp. 119-150); and "pestilence" (Pest, pp. 151-192). Charms appear in connection with the two latter ones; this, Honko states, is due to the fact that the first concept explained only diseases of animals, and charms thus would be useless. In connection of the "shot" Honko is able to illustrate the point that tradition lives by force of its function: in a North-Finnish area where epidemic diseases of domestic animals occurred frequently during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the concept is still alive.

At the end of the study, Honko establishes what he calls das Idealschema des Heilungsaktes, the ideal scheme of cure. He finds 15 motifs (a-o) which can occur in the procedure; but he is not able to present descriptions which would contain all 15. In everyday terms, his scheme contains all that can happen in the cure. If his scheme is applicable, we are here dealing with the start of structural analysis of non-verbal folklore; until the present day folklorists have hardly started with the structural study of folk literature. Honko maintains that his scheme can be applied to the study of all disease concepts in action. I checked the scheme against John Gillin's detailed description of a case of the "magical fright" in Guatemala (Psychiatry, II [1948], pp. 387-400), and, indeed, found the following motifs of Honko's scheme: a-b-c-d-e-j-k-j-f-g-h-i-l-m-n-o. Maybe we will have something like a motif-index of action one day!

As a whole, Lauri Honko's work is highly interesting. A vast amount of material is here mastered in a way that makes the study clear, logical, and readable. Honko seems a scholar with a moving spirit, able to change his viewpoint when needed. Honko combines different approaches—comparative, functionalistic—in a plausible way. This concept of disease, one feels, has now its adequate treatise; and we hope the other concepts will soon find their investigators.

Elli Kaija Kōngäs
Indiana University

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Anon. Hungarians in Czechoslovakia. New York: Research Institute for Minority Studies on Hungarians, 1959. 167 pp., \$3.00.
- R. Auty. Handbook of Old Church Slavonic, II: Texts and Glossary. (London East European Series.) Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Books, 1960. x, 148, 42s.
- Frederick C. Barghoorn. The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1960. vii, 353, \$7.50.
- Edward H. Carr. Socialism in One Country, Vol. II. New York: Macmillan, 1960. viii, 493, \$7.50.

- Misha H. Fayer. Workbook for Basic Russian. Book One. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp. [c. 1960]. 126 pp.
- R. Filipović. The Phonemic Analysis of English Loan-Words in Croatian. Zagreb: Univ. of Zagreb, Institute of Phonetics, 1960. 137 pp.
- Richard Freeborn. Turgenev: The Novelist's Novelist. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960. xii, 201 pp.
- Elliot R. Goodman. The Soviet Design for a World State. (Studies of the Russian Institute.) New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. xviii, 512, \$6.75.
- John N. Hazard. Settling Disputes in Soviet Society: The Formative Years of Legal Institutions. (Studies of the Russian Institute.) New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. xiv, 534, \$9.50.
- Helene Iswolsky. Christ in Russia: The History, Tradition, and Life of the Russian Church. Milwaukee: Bruce Publ. Co. [c. 1960]. x, 213, \$3.95.
- Ante Kadić. Croatian Reader With Vocabulary. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1960. 276 pp.
- George F. Kennan. Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917-1941. (Anvil Books, No. 47.) New York: D. Van Nostrand [c. 1960]. 191 pp., \$1.25.
- Calvin Kephart. Races of Mankind: Their Origin and Migration. New York: Philosophical Library [c. 1960]. xiv, 566, \$6.00.
- Vasili Klyuchevsky. Peter the Great. Tr. Liliana Archibald. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958. xii, 282, \$6.75.
- Josef Korbelt. The Communist Subversion of Czechoslovakia, 1938-1948: The Failure of Coexistence. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1959. xii, 258, \$5.00.
- Stanislaw Kot. Georges Niemirycz et la lutte contre l'intolérance au 17^e siècle. (Musagetes, VIII.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1960. 78 pp.
- Nicholas Maltzoff. Advanced Conversational Russian. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp. [c. 1960]. v, 58 pp.
- Anatole G. Mazour. Rise and Fall of the Romanovs. (Anvil Books, No. 50.) New York: D. Van Nostrand [c. 1960]. 189 pp., \$1.25.
- Grigore Nandris. Handbook of Old Church Slavonic, I: Old Church Slavonic Grammar. (London East European Series.) Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Books, 1959. xvi, 235, 63s.
- Bruno Nettl. Cheremis Musical Styles. (Indiana University Folklore Series, 14.) Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1960. xv, 108, \$5.00.
- Joseph Novak. The Future Is Ours, Comrade: Conversations with the Russians. Introd. I. R. Levine. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1960. 286 pp., \$3.95.

- Joseph Paučo. Christian Slovakia Under Communism. Valparaiso, Ind.: The Slovak Catholic Federation of America, 1959. 31 pp.
- Marianna Poltoratzky and Michael Zarechnak. Russkij jazyk, Pervaja kniga. (Modern Series in Foreign Languages.) Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co. [c. 1960]. xi, 278, 12, \$4.50.
- Ingrid Schellbach. Das wogulische Rätsel. (Ural-Altaische Bibliothek, VIII.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959. 136 pp., DM 16.
- Andrew J. Schwartz. America and the Russo-Finnish War. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1960]. vii, 103, \$3.25.
- Mikhail Sholokhov. The Fate of Man. (Russian Reader, II.) New York: D. Van Nostrand Co. [c. 1960]. xv, 80, \$1.25.
- Roman Smal-Stocki. The Captive Nations: Nationalism of the Non-Russian Nations in the Soviet Union. New York: Bookman Associates [c. 1960]. 118 pp., \$3.50.
- Leo Tolstoy. The Death of Ivan Ilych and Other Stories. (Signet Classics CD13.) New York: The New American Library [c. 1960]. 304 pp., \$0.50.
- Ivan Turgenev. First Love. (Russian Reader, II.) New York: D. Van Nostrand Co. [c. 1960]. xi, 162, \$1.95.
- I. S. Vaxros. Naimenovanija obuvi v russkom jazyke, I: Drevneišie naimenovanija, do petrovskoj epoxi. (Annuaire de l'Institut Finlandais d'Études Soviétiques, Supplément du No. 6-10.) Helsinki, 1959. 271 pp.
- Franco Venturi. Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia. Tr. from Italian, Francis Haskell. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1960. xxxiii, 850, \$12.75.

NEWS AND NOTES

Editorial Staff of the Journal

We are happy to announce that the Journal now has Associate Editors for each of the important areas it covers. In addition to the Editor and the Editorial Committee, which have not been changed since the beginning of the New Series in 1957 (and which are listed in the Contents), the Editorial Staff now includes the following members, with fields of primary responsibility as indicated: Morton Benson, Univ. of Pennsylvania (Pedagogy); Wayne D. Fisher, Canton Senior High School, Canton, Ill. (High School); Edward Stankiewicz, Indiana Univ. (Linguistics); Walter Vickery, Indiana Univ. (Literature); and Helen Yakobson, George Washington Univ. (News and Notes). Felix J. Oinas, Indiana Univ., is Review Editor. Materials or communications may be directed to the relevant member of the Editorial Staff or directly to the Editor. The growth of the Staff is making it possible, we trust, for the Journal better to fulfill its challenge and obligations to all engaged in teaching and research in the field of Slavic and East European languages, linguistics, and literature.

AATSEEL Chapter and Other Professional Meetings

New York—New Jersey Regional AATSEEL Chapter (submitted by Olga S. Fedoroff). The twenty-first meeting—Annual Fall Conference—of the New York-New Jersey Regional Chapter was held on October 22, 1960, at the Firestone Library at Princeton University. After morning registration, members were offered a tour of the Princeton Campus and a visit to the language laboratory.

The meeting was chaired by Prof. Albert Parry, Colgate University, Chapter President, and opened with welcome addresses by Edward D. Sullivan, Chairman of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, Princeton Univ., and by Ludmilla B. Turkevich, Princeton Univ. and Douglass Coll. The meeting was devoted to the theme: Your Government and You, with the following reports delivered: "Enrollment in Russian in the United States," by J. Wesley Childers, Director of Research, Foreign Language Program Research Center in New York, Modern Language Association of America; "The Position of Russian in the National Defense Education Act Language Institutes," by Lawrence Poston, Jr., Specialist for Language Institutes, Language Development Section, Financial Aid Branch, Division of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, SEEJ, New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII) (1960)

Washington, D. C.; "The State-Sponsored Russian Language Program in New York," by Richard A. Waite, Jr., Executive Assistant for Higher Education, New York State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.; and "Russian in New Jersey," by Robert S. Fleming, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Department of Education of the State of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J. These reports were followed by a discussion from the floor.

In the business session, the following officers and members of the executive committee of the chapter were elected: president, Prof. Turkevich; vice presidents, Bohdan F. Pawlowicz, Canisius Coll., Nicholas Pervouchine, United Nations (N. Y. C.), and Pieter Zilinsky, Walt Whitman High School, Huntington Station, Long Island, N. Y.; secretary-treasurer, Olga S. Fedoroff, Syracuse Univ. AFIT Language Program; and ex-officio directors, Prof. Parry and Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar Coll. The Secretary-Treasurer's report was given by Prof. Fedoroff. At the end of the business meeting Prof. Wolkonsky presented to the retiring president, Prof. Parry, a beautifully illustrated volume as a token of appreciation on behalf of the executive committee.

Indiana AATSEEL Chapter. The Indiana AATSEEL Chapter met in conjunction with the Indiana State Teachers Association in Indianapolis, on October 27. Wayne D. Fisher, Canton Senior High School, Canton, Ill., gave a talk at the ISTA meeting on "No English from the First Day," describing how he teaches Russian to secondary-school students. At the afternoon Indiana AATSEEL Chapter meeting, Symond Yavener, Indiana Univ., spoke on "An American's Observations of the Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Soviet Union." The following officers were elected for the calendar year 1961: president, George Schultz, Purdue Univ., president; Keith Myers, Earlham Coll., vice president; and George F. Roe, Speedway High School, secretary-treasurer.

National Council of High School Teachers of Russian. The annual meeting of NCHSTR took place at DePaul Univ., Chicago, Ill., on July 16, 1960. Wayne D. Fisher, president, chaired the all-day meeting, which concerned the purpose and organization of the NCHSTR, its relationship with the AATSEEL and the MLA, and its publication, *Vestnik*. The feeling with regard to the AATSEEL was that it deals chiefly with problems of college teaching and that many of its college members are misinformed or do not comprehend the specific needs of the high school teacher. Reports given included the following: a description of the language laboratory at St. Catherine's High School in Racine, Wisconsin; by Sister Marie Joseph, O. P.; a description by Mr. Fisher of his success in teaching Russian to students with "below average" general academic records (his experience shows that "no student with sufficient interest in the study of Russian should be deprived of the opportunity on account of his performance in other subject areas"); a report on experimental classes of gifted students at Hyde Park High School, Chicago, by Mrs. Agnes Jacques Chadwick; and a report on experiences in teaching Russian in Duquesne High School, Pennsylvania, by Joseph Harsky. The following officers were elected for

1960-61: president, Mr. Fisher; vice president, Gustave W. Carlson, Maine Township High School (West), Des Plaines, Illinois; corresponding secretary, Sister Marie Joseph; and recording secretary, Mrs. Chadwick.

[If the proposed constitutional amendment is accepted at the December national AATSEEL meeting, two of the vice presidents of the AATSEEL henceforth will be secondary-school teachers (see Spring 1960 issue of the Journal, p. 88); Mr. Fisher has accepted the appointment as an Associate Editor of the Journal, with responsibility for the secondary school. We agree that the AATSEEL, in its national and chapter meetings and in its publication must give adequate consideration to the needs and interests of secondary-school teachers in our field. —Editor.]

Study and Research-Related Travel in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

Seven of the twenty-two Americans in the Soviet Union for the academic year 1960-61 in the exchange program with the Soviet Union, are in the fields of Slavic languages and literatures. They are as follows: (1) at Leningrad State University, Marguerite Barberat (Ph. D. candidate, Univ. of California, Berkeley), Tatjana Cizevska (Asst. Prof., Univ. of Illinois), and Richard Doucette (Ph. D. candidate, Univ. of Washington, Seattle); and (2) at Moscow State University, Sanford Couch (Ph. D. candidate, Univ. of Wisconsin); Charles E. Gribble (Univ. of Washington, Seattle); Donald Lesh (Ph. D. candidate, Harvard Univ.); and Richard Z. Yatzeck (Ph. D. candidate, Univ. of Wisconsin).

The closing date for applications for exchange students for 1961-62 is January 5, 1961. Applicants may be graduate students, young instructors, and post-doctoral researchers; applicants may be from any field of study, so long as they can demonstrate that there is reasonable professional benefit to be derived from the proposed plan of study. Periods of study from five to fifteen months normally be arranged. Interested persons for 1961-62 and future years should address their requests to the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, Box 70, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

A Faculty Grant Program may also be available for study and research-related travel in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. To be eligible, an applicant must be fully trained and post-doctoral, a college or university faculty specialist on the area or areas to be visited and competent in the languages of those areas. For information, one should write to the Inter-University Committee.

Testing Project

The MLA has contracted with the U. S. Office of Education to produce tests in four skills (listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing) and in five languages (French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish). In each of these twenty areas there will be two alternate forms of an elementary test (grades 6-9) and an advanced test (grades 10-12), a total of eighty tests.

Directors of the project will be Donald Walsh of the MLA FL Program Research Center and Nelson Brooks, who will be on leave of absence from Yale for the first year of the three-year project. Working with the MLA in the production, pretesting, and norming of the tests will be the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, through whose Cooperative Test Division they will eventually be available. Chairman of the committees for Russian: John F. Beebe, Indiana Univ., Speaking; Edward J. Brown, Brown Univ., Writing; Deming Brown, Univ. of Michigan, Listening; and Mrs. Claire Walter, Friends School, Baltimore, Reading.

Association of Teachers of Russian (ATR) in Great Britain

The ATR was organized in January 1959 at Oxford University. Its membership is thinly spread over a large area and, in order to draw more members into active participation, a number of local groups (kruzhki) have been set up. ATR differs from the AATSEEL in that it acts as a central body for the profession, and, through its various subcommittees, concerns itself more directly with the immediate needs of its members. Thus, we read in the ATR's journal that a great deal of work has been done on the definition of a basic vocabulary for the General Competence Examination Ordinary Level. A suggested preliminary list of 2,000 words has been prepared and is now being considered by the committee. The completed version will be submitted for examination by the university examining authorities: it is intended that the agreed version be published as a booklet. It will also be used as the basis for the ATR Course-Book (two years to ordinary level) and for complementary readers prepared by members under the guidance of the Textbook Committee.

Professor Helen Jakobson, Chairman of the Committee for the Promotion of Russian and Other East European Languages in the American Secondary School, has established contact with the ATR and receives its publication, the ATR Broadsheet. She feels that a regular exchange of information on what is being done to promote the study of Russian in each country, teaching methods, use of textbooks, readers, etc., should be most beneficial to each organization.

Last year a course for British teachers of Russian was held in Moscow under the agreement for Cultural Exchanges between Great Britain and the USSR. Six university lecturers and 19 secondary school teachers attended. The course consisted of 5 hours study a day - Monday - Saturday - for 4 weeks; i. e., 120 hours in all. Five groups of 5 members each were formed for practical oral work with non-English speaking teachers. These activities occupied 3 hours a day and for a further 2 hours all attended Russian lectures together.

Language Development Program: The Modern Language Association Reports on State Standards for Modern Foreign Language Teachers Title VI

The Modern Language Association has submitted a report on the status of language instruction in the U.S., on a survey of certification procedures and qualifications for the teaching of modern foreign languages in the public secondary schools. The study was conducted under an NDEA Language Development contract. The major conclusions of the survey are these:

- 1) There is no indication from any State that the number of credit hours required may be reduced because of the shortage of qualified teachers. On the contrary, a number of States are actively at work to raise these requirements.
[The lowest State certification requirement is 12 semester hours and the highest 36—with 20 States requiring 24 hours, 10 requiring 18, 8 requiring 15, leaving a few in between these figures].
- 2) No State requires its language teachers to be able to speak the languages they teach. (However, it is a fairly common practice of the States to accept the recommendations of the colleges themselves as to the audio-lingual proficiency of the graduate. States have not identified the competencies for foreign language teachers, and none has as yet set up a testing machinery for oral approval.)
- 3) In general, the States have no provision for the accreditation of teachers who have been educated abroad, are proficient in the language, and have a academic background equal to the B. A. Twenty-one States, however, grant special or temporary certificates and waivers or postponements of standard requirements in professional education if the candidate's credentials are deemed adequate.

The general conclusions that may be drawn from the report are, first, that certification requirements in most States are extremely low and must inevitably result in inferior preparation for language teaching in the schools; second, that the failure of State certification agencies to require the candidate for language teaching to have oral proficiency in the language encourages omission of training in speaking of languages in the colleges.

In Brief

There is now under way a revision and continuation of the instructional materials to provide for at least four years (7-12) in Spanish, French, German, Russian, and Italian. A total of ten new units were prepared in these five languages for the 1960 NDEA summer language institutes. A number of schools, selected as field trial centers, will test the materials as they are developed. The new materials, including teacher's manuals, student workbooks, and a complete set of recordings, will not

be generally available before school year 1961-62. An announcement will be made, probably in late spring 1961, concerning the date and place of publication and cost.

Under an NDEA contract, the University of Michigan will produce complete programs of basic materials for learning Chinese, Russian, and Spanish; these materials will incorporate for the first time principles of learning now being widely studied and applied by leading psychologists in other fields.

Out of a total of 2,514 American colleges and universities, 576, according to our latest figures, are now teaching Russian. Approximately 600 secondary schools are offering Russian during 1960-61.

NDEA Area Centers for the Academic Year 1960-61: (1) Russian Language and Area Center at Fordham, Illinois, and Michigan Universities, (2) Slavic Languages and Area Center at Harvard, Indiana, and Pa. Universities, (3) Other: Univ. of Calif. and Univ. of Colorado (East European Languages and Area Centers); Columbia Univ. (Soviet and East European Language and Area Center); Univ. of So. Calif. (Soviet-Asian Studies Center); Univ. of Washington (Far Eastern and Russian Languages and Area Center).

The Arizona Language School, Phoenix, Ariz., offers an unusual educational opportunity for FL study. It carries a complete program from kindergarten (ages 3, 4, or 5) through the 12th grade, in 3 languages. One-third of each day's work for all students in all subjects is given in Russian, one-third in Spanish and one-third in English. An hour or more is taken from the above when Latin and Greek are begun in the 3rd grade. Students are admitted only at ages 3-8. All students come to the school 5 days a week, Monday through Friday, 255 days a year.

An experimental project to teach Russian through arithmetic to all children in grades 3 through 8 was started in rural Jefferson County, Missouri last fall and involved about 250 pupils. Teachers are learning the language at the same time as their pupils, with the support of tapes prepared by specialists. The core of the program is arithmetic, using Russian primarily for numbers and arithmetical processes, but social and functional phrases and expressions are also taught. Pupils are encouraged to use the Russian they have learned in all their classes. This fall the project will be expanded to the Parkway Consolidated Schools of Creve Coeur suburb of St. Louis County. Six hundred pupils in all the third grades of that system will participate.

The first Russian college board in history will be offered in March (aimed at second-year students, and for this first year, a written test only).

See you at The Annual Meeting!

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Published by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SLAVIC
AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

The Slavic and East European Journal, a journal devoted to research and pedagogy, is the official publication of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, AATSEEL of the U.S., Inc., an affiliate of AATSEEL of Canada. This publication is the successor to The AATSEEL Journal and The AATSEEL Bulletin. The Journal is published quarterly through the facilities of Indiana University.

Subscription to The Slavic and East European Journal is \$5.00 per year for individuals, libraries, and institutions. The subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL. A special rate of \$2.00 per year has been set for undergraduate and graduate students. Single copies may be purchased for \$1.50.

Applications for membership, subscriptions to the Journal, and all other business letters should be sent to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, manuscripts, exchange journals, and copy for advertisements should be sent to J. T. Shaw, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff.

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

The only American journal concentrating in research in the humanities and pedagogy in the field; articles, reviews, news and notes

Published by the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL) through the facilities of Indiana University

Subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL for individuals. Subscription membership: \$5.00 per year; \$2.00 for undergraduate and graduate students

Members will receive, through an arrangement with the Indiana University Slavic and East European Series, two bonus volumes during 1960:

Avrahm Yarmolinsky, *Literature Under Communism: The Literary Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin* (1960)

The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1959

For subscriptions, advertising rates, and back numbers, write to Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the AATSEEL,

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

"The outstanding general journal of modern language teaching in the United States"

THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

brings to its readers every month stimulating and helpful articles on methods, materials, pedagogical research, publications and textbooks in the field.

Edited by J. Alan Pfeffer, The University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. Published by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations.

Eight issues a year, monthly except June, July, August, and September. Current subscription \$4.00 a year. Foreign countries, \$4.50 a year net in U.S.A. funds.

Sample copy on request

The Modern Language Journal

Stephen L. Pitcher, Business Manager

7144 Washington Avenue
ST. LOUIS 30, MISSOURI

Announcing
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SLAVIC LINGUISTICS
AND POETICS

Editorial Board:

Roman Jakobson
C. H. van Schooneveld
Chr. S. Stang
Francis J. Whitfield

Harvard University and M.I.T.
Stanford University
University of Oslo
University of California

Editorial Address

International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics
c/o Miss A. Plate
Haarlemmer Trekvaart 22
Oestgeest, The Netherlands

IJSLP appears in issues of approximately 160 to 200 pages. Issues are not bound to fixed dates. The subscription price is Gld. 15.—(\$4, sh. 28/9, DM 16.50) per issue; single issues cost Gld. 19.—(\$5, sh. 36/—, DM 21.—).

A Wide Choice of Textbooks—Teaching Aids

for study of RUSSIAN by non-Russian students regularly used
in middle school and colleges in the USSR

**LATEST EDITIONS of ENGLISH-RUSSIAN and RUSSIAN-ENGLISH
DICTIONARIES (new orthography)**

GEOGRAPHICAL ATLASES and MAPS

**Inexpensive editions of Russian CLASSIC WORKS used by most
American schools for students' reading assignments**

TALKING PHONOGRAPH RECORDS
acts from plays — monologues

Excellent for students' practice study in pronunciation
Ask for our TX 60 Catalogue

Four Continent Book Corp.

822 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Phone: GR 3-2018

AATSEEL OFFICERS, 1959 (continued from inside front cover)

II. Chapter Officers (cont.)

New England Chapter

President: Valerie Tumins, Brown Univ.

Secretary-Treasurer: Joachim Baer, Harvard Univ.

New York - New Jersey Regional Chapter

President: Ludmilla B. Turkevich, Princeton Univ. and
Douglass Coll.

Vice Presidents: Bohdan F. Pawlowicz, Canisius Coll.

Nicholas Pervouchine, United Nations (N. Y. C.)

Pieter Zilinsky, Walt Whitman High School,
Hunting Station, Long Island, N. Y.

Secretary-Treasurer: Olga S. Fedoroff, Syracuse Univ. AFT
Language Program

North Dakota Chapter

President: Norman Balfour Levin, Univ. of North Dakota

Vice President: Nicholas Kohanowski, Univ. of North Dakota

Secretary-Treasurer: Sister Dolores Berry, St. Mary's School,
Grand Forks

Ohio Chapter

President: Frank R. Silbajoris, Oberlin Coll.

Secretary-Treasurer: Branko A. Yirka, St. Edward High School
Cleveland

Oklahoma Chapter

President: Mrs. Flossie Grogan, Ada Junior High School, Ada

Vice President: Mrs. Wayne Edmister, Oklahoma State Univ.

Secretary-Treasurer: Herta Herglotz, Univ. of Oklahoma

Oregon Chapter

President: Mrs. Vera Krivoshein, Reed Coll.

Vice Presidents: R. E. Steussey, Univ. of Oregon

Loretta Wollett, Cleveland High School, Portland

Secretary-Treasurer: Mrs. Douglas Cooper, Willamette Univ.

Pennsylvania Chapter

President: Frances De Graaf, Bryn Mawr Coll.

Vice President: Anna Pircenok, Univ. of Pennsylvania

Secretary-Treasurer: William J. Frey, Franklin and Marshall
Coll.

Rhode Island Chapter

President: Valerie Tumins, Brown Univ.

Secretary-Treasurer: Chester Kisiel, Cranston High School

Texas Chapter

President: Eduard Miček, Univ. of Texas

Vice President: M. I. Smith, Univ. of Texas

Secretary-Treasurer: Joe Malik, Jr., Univ. of Texas

Washington Chapter

President: Lew R. Mickleson, Univ. of Washington

Vice President: Noah D. Gershevsky, Univ. of Washington

Secretary-Treasurer: Laurence C. Thompson, Univ. of
Washington

Washington, D. C., Nearby Maryland, and Virginia Chapter

President: Helen Yakobson, George Washington Univ.

Treasurer: Tatiana Fotitch, Catholic Univ.

Secretary: Alex Pronin, Johns Hopkins Univ.

III. Committee for the Promotion of Russian and Other East European
Languages in the American Secondary School

Chairman: Helen B. Yakobson, George Washington Univ.

RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN SERIES

Russian and East European Institute
Indiana University

Thomas A. Sebeok, *Editor*; Robert F. Byrnes, William B. Edgerton, Norman J. G. Pounds, Nicolas Spulber, and Robert C. Tucker, *Associate Editors*

VOLUMES IN PRINT

- | | | |
|--------|---|--------|
| No. 1 | Eeva K. Minn, <i>Studies in Cheremis</i> , Vol. 4, <i>Derivation</i> (1956). | \$2.00 |
| No. 2 | Michael Ginsburg and Joseph T. Shaw, Eds., <i>Indiana Slavic Studies</i> , Vol. 1 (1956). | \$3.00 |
| No. 3 | Piotr S. Wandycz, <i>Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation</i> (1956). | \$2.50 |
| No. 4 | Norman J. G. Pounds and Nicolas Spulber, Eds., <i>Resources and Planning in Eastern Europe</i> (1957). | \$2.50 |
| No. 7 | Mark V. Vishniak, "Souremennye Zapiski"— <i>Memoirs of the Editor</i> (1957). (In Russian.) | \$4.00 |
| No. 10 | Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, <i>The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1957</i> (1958). | \$2.00 |
| No. 11 | Norman J. G. Pounds, <i>The Upper Silesian Industrial Region</i> (1958). | \$4.00 |
| No. 12 | Robert F. Byrnes, <i>Bibliography of American Publications on East Central Europe, 1945-1957</i> (1958). | \$2.50 |
| No. 14 | Vaclav L. Benes, Robert F. Byrnes, and Nicolas Spulber, Eds., <i>The Second Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute</i> (Full text of main documents) (1959). | \$3.50 |
| No. 15 | Robert F. Byrnes, Ed., <i>The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana</i> (1959). | \$2.00 |
| No. 16 | Paul L. Horecky, <i>Libraries and Bibliographic Centers in the Soviet Union</i> (1959). (Cloth bound, \$6.00.) | \$3.00 |
| No. 17 | Barbara Jelavich, <i>Russia and the Rumanian National Cause (1858-1859)</i> (1959). | \$4.00 |
| No. 18 | Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, <i>The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1958</i> (1959). | \$2.00 |
| No. 19 | Boris I. Gorokhoff, <i>Publishing in the U.S.S.R.</i> (1959). (Cloth bound, \$6.00.) | \$3.00 |
| No. 20 | Avrahm Yarmolinsky, <i>Literature Under Communism: the Literary Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin</i> (1960). | \$4.00 |
| No. 21 | Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, <i>The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1959</i> . | \$3.00 |

Volumes in Preparation

- | | |
|--------|--|
| No. 22 | Marvin Rintala, <i>Three Generations: The Extreme Right Wing in Finnish Politics</i> . |
| No. 23 | M. Dragomanov, <i>Notes on the Slavic Religio-Ethical Legends: The Dualistic Creation of the World</i> . (Trans. by Earl W. Count.)
Lilien's <i>English-Polish Dictionary</i> is now distributed in connection with this Series. Fascicles 1-19 are available at \$1.50 each. |

All correspondence should be addressed to the

EDITOR, RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN SERIES
RAYL HOUSE, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA